

University of Dundee

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) and the
development of the Arts Council in Scotland
background, politics, visual art policy 1919-1947**

McArthur, Euan

Award date:
2005

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) and the development of the Arts Council in Scotland

background, politics, visual art policy 1919-1947

Euan McArthur

2005

University of Dundee

Conditions for Use and Duplication

Copyright of this work belongs to the author unless otherwise identified in the body of the thesis. It is permitted to use and duplicate this work only for personal and non-commercial research, study or criticism/review. You must obtain prior written consent from the author for any other use. Any quotation from this thesis must be acknowledged using the normal academic conventions. It is not permitted to supply the whole or part of this thesis to any other person or to post the same on any website or other online location without the prior written consent of the author. Contact the Discovery team (discovery@dundee.ac.uk) with any queries about the use or acknowledgement of this work.

THESIS
2005

**The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the
Arts (CEMA) and the Development of the Arts
Council in Scotland**

**Background, Politics, Visual Art Policy
1919-1947**

A thesis submitted to the University of Dundee

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the Faculty of Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design

Volume Two

Visual Art Policy

Euan C. McArthur

School of Fine Art

July 2005

**The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA)
and the Development of the Arts Council in Scotland:**

Background, Politics and Policy

1919-1947

Volume Two

Visual Art Policy

Volume Two

Contents

Part Five: Visual Art Policy and Activities, 1940-47

Chapter 14	Reaction and Initiative	231
	Policy Objectives	234
	Visual Art Policy	236
	Policy and its Discontents	238
Chapter 15	Visual Art Activities, 1940-47	248
	Exhibitions Overview, 1940-46	249
	Gallery Exhibitions	257
	Geographical Range	259
	Schools as Venues	262
	Exhibitions, 1946-47	264
	Exhibitions of Reproductions, 1940-46	264
	Exhibitions and Artists	267
	Attaining Policy Aims	277
	Encouraging Higher Standards	278
	Improving Accessibility	279
	Attendance	286

Part Six: Conclusion

Chapter 16	CEMA and the Arts Council in Scotland	295
	CEMA's Scottish Affinities	296
	CEMA and the Politics of Identity	299
	CEMA and the Politics of Education	304

Osborne Mavor as Chairman	309
Hegemony or Assimilation?	313
Scottish Visual Art and Modernism	322

Appendices, Bibliography and Archives

Appendix One: Council and Scottish Committee Members	1
Appendix Two: Tables	3
Appendix Three: Scottish Finance, 1940-47	19
Appendix Four: Selective Biographies	24
Appendix Five: Idealism and Citizenship	36
Bibliography	74
Archives (acronyms)	88

Tables (Appendix Two)

Table 1	Exhibitions in Scotland, 1940-46
Table 2	Total new exhibitions, showings, venues and centres, 1940-46
Table 3	New exhibitions by producer, 1940-46
Table 4	New exhibitions shown in Scotland, as percentages compared to British totals, 1940-45
Table 5	Scottish-produced new exhibitions compared to London-produced exhibitions shown in Scotland, 1940-45
Table 6	Identifiable showings in Scotland as percentages of England and Wales totals, 1940-45
Table 7	BIAE/Scottish Branch and CEMA/Scottish committee share of showings in Scotland, 1940-46
Table 8	Annual total of identifiable showings by producer, 1940-46
Table 9	Exhibitions with particular Scottish content, 1940-46
Table 10	Breakdown of exhibitions by content, 1940-46
Table 11	Individual main gallery totals, 1940-46
Table 12	Major gallery showings, 1940-46
Table 13	Exhibitions by gallery, 1940-46
Table 14	Exhibitions shown in art galleries only, 1940-46
Table 15	Identifiable Scottish centres where exhibitions (other than reproductions) were shown, 1940-46
Table 16	Identifiable counties where exhibitions (other than reproductions) were shown, 1940-46

Table 17	Venues unidentified with any location where exhibitions (other than reproductions) were shown, 1940-46
Table 18	Showings by geographical area, 1940-46
Table 19	Showings related to Populations of Burghs and Counties
Table 20	Counties that had no identifiable exhibitions, 1940-46
Table 21	Ratios of Exhibitions to Populations (major cities)
Table 22	Identifiable schools used for exhibitions, 1940-46
Table 23	Exhibitions shown in Scottish schools, 1940-46
Table 24	Identifiable exhibitions of reproductions, 1940-46
Table 25	Scottish schools that showed reproductions, 1940-46
Table 26	Total identifiable sets and showings of reproductions in Scotland, 1940-46

Part Five

Visual Art Policy and Activities

1940-1947

Chapter 14: Reaction and Initiative

In Volume One I discussed the background and politics of CEMA and the Arts Council in Scotland. I now turn to the linked issues of policy and practical activities, through which both justified their claims to public funding, and specifically to a place in the social and cultural life of Scotland. They and the Scottish Committee existed for a purpose that, although fully evolved over a few years, had two consistent elements: to make the arts more accessible to more people and to encourage high standards. The first was a social and political justification, the second artistic, but how each was to be reconciled with the other was left to practice to determine. Three questions arise that I turn to now: how was the task conceived of, what was actually done and with what success? To attempt an answer, I look first at policy in its British and Scottish dimensions (did they vary?) and secondly identify as accurately I can the visual art activities through which policy was pursued. Through the latter, I then attempt an assessment of the achievement in Scotland up to 1947.

‘Policy’ in broad terms means a course of action, including the identification of objectives and the operational plans for their attainment. The formulation of a course of action need not be thought of as policy for policy to exist. Roy Shaw, Secretary General of the Arts Council from 1975 to 1983, was critical that for most of its history the Council had seen no need for “a general policy for the arts”. He cited the view of Arnold Goodman, the Council’s Chairman from 1965 to 1972, that it was not the business of an un-elected body to make cultural policy.¹ The Council’s role was essentially passive, to respond to what artists brought to it. Goodman, in fact, stoutly maintained the right of people to remain ‘uncultured’: it was a matter of personal choice. This anti-policy stance reflects a time when formal accountability was less

onerous than now. In the 1940s a public culture that expected detailed policy statements for the arts did not exist. Such statements are absent from CEMA and early Arts Council documents and annual reports. Scottish records are no different. 'Policy' is mentioned sporadically, usually briefly and in broad terms. In the period up to 1964 (when the Labour government published its White Paper, *A Policy for the Arts*) the Arts Council was at its least accountable. It was a backwater with a budget, in 1961, lower than the Ministry of Building and Works' budget for replacing its carpets and curtains.² The first mention of the arts in an election manifesto was by the Labour Party in 1950.³ The Conservatives' first arts policy statement dates from 1964. The appointment of Jennie Lee as Minister for the Arts that year gave politicians a closer formal interest in the Arts Council, but even so (as Goodman's example testifies) this had little impact on the Arts Council at the level of policy.

CEMA, the Arts Council and the Scottish Committee were all small, non-representative, paternalistic bodies. Through its intermediate status CEMA was entrusted with the responsibility for formulating policy which, though not handed down by government, could be endorsed by it. Policy at first was formed within very limited time horizons but even so, the outlines of its mature policy appear very quickly. It had to define policy broadly enough to accommodate its 'purists' and its 'popularisers', those more interested in high standards and those more concerned to make the arts accessible. Jones, who (for example) invited Sir Kenneth Clark and Sir Walford Davies to join CEMA (the one a purist and the other a populariser) believed in reconciling different points of view in good liberal and Idealist fashion. Mavor aimed for a similar accommodation on the Scottish Committee. He invited the flamboyant showman Tom Honeyman to sit with Sir George Pirie, the traditionalist President of the RSA, precisely

(as he put it) “to bed the Lion with the Lamb”.⁴ The aim was to signal that the Scottish Committee belonged to no faction or interest group. In his reply to a complaint about an exhibition in 1945 (“How long must this form of blasphemy last? How long have we to suffer seeing our Scottish landscapes caricatured?”) Mavor described an impeccably even-handed policy:

Any pleasure to be derived from the pictures...is not likely to be enhanced by looking at them through red spectacles. ...I have to face the fact that a large number of contemporary artists prefer to paint this way. They may be wrong to do so; but the ultimate judges of how painting should be done are the artists themselves... If they do so against public and senior professional criticism the Arts Council can only assume they are honest and give them a showing. Its duty is not to express an opinion but to hold the balance fairly between traditionalism and experiment.⁵

Mavor presents the Scottish Committee as properly being reactive to what artists were choosing to do and assisting the public to come to terms with that. As far as it goes, this was true. The horror of officially approved culture was genuine, shared by conservative and liberal opinion. However, the whole picture was not so clear-cut. There could be no purely reactive stance that was separate from the preferences and interests represented on the Council or on the Scottish Committee. Even CEMA’s early educational interests had an underlying strategic aim, the production of an informed and cultured citizenry. Later in the 1940s the Arts Council, in contrast, began to promote developments such as the formation of ‘national’ opera and ballet companies, and the Edinburgh Festival, which were driven by the Keynesian ideal of excellence and the desire to make London

pre-eminent in the arts. In these cases, initiative and energy came from within the Council in partnership with external agents. In reality, then, both the Council and the Scottish Committee pursued their objectives (in Hector Hetherington's terms) partly through response and partly through initiative.

Policy Objectives

Consensus held around the general character and ambitions of CEMA and the Arts Council. CEMA's objectives in December 1939 were given as being to assist "music, drama, the arts and handicrafts generally, as distinct from other activities...on the fringe of adult education".⁶ In January 1940 it was declared that the "general aim of the committee is to rescue those cultural activities and interests which are threatened with extinction by war-time conditions...".⁷ By March 1940 Jones was aiming at a more comprehensive arts policy on a 'national' (that is, British) scale, embracing both the amateur side and the professional. Objectives were now defined systematically and treated as complementary rather than antagonistic:

- (a) The preservation so far as possible of the highest standards in war-time of the arts of music, drama, and painting and design.
- (b) The widespread provision of opportunities for hearing good music and for the enjoyment of the arts generally among people who, on account of war-time conditions, have been cut off from these things.
- (c) The encouragement of music-making and play-acting by the people themselves.

(d) Through the above activities, the rendering of indirect assistance to professional singers and players who may be suffering from a war-time lack of demand for their work.⁸

These objectives were drawn up when partnership with the Carnegie UK Trust was still confidently anticipated, which helps explain the shift in CEMA's priorities towards professional standards, amateur participation being the arena in which the Carnegie UK Trust had the greater experience. When the Carnegie trustees terminated the relationship in June 1940 it signalled the effective end of Jones' hopes for a comprehensive approach under the CEMA banner. Though never wholly disengaged, amateurism soon began to occupy a declining place in the policies of CEMA and a minor one in the Arts Council's. CEMA's potential to lead a co-ordinated cultural policy for everyone (the radical potential that Hewison argues was betrayed by Keynes's elitism) was effectively lost before Keynes's arrival. The formulation of CEMA's major tasks became the Janus-faced policy inherited by the Arts Council and its successors. The continuity can be seen in the Charter of 1946, under which the Arts Council existed for the purpose of:

...developing a greater knowledge, understanding and practice of the fine arts exclusively, and in particular to increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public throughout Our Realm, to improve the standard of execution of the fine arts...⁹

At the level of implementation, CEMA's policy was empirical. The main methods of funding were rapidly developed, as was the practice of supporting the work of some independent companies while directly organising its own programmes. The performing

arts were first supported through grants to voluntary (non profit-distributing) organisations. Next, still in early 1940, CEMA developed its own system of providing concerts and drama. In the visual arts, exhibitions were provided through the BIAE, from 1942 joined by CEMA's own gallery-oriented output. The system of offering guarantees against loss rather than grants also began in 1940, largely through pressure from Keynes. Within a few months, then, CEMA was operating a mixed economy of grants and guarantees to independent organisations, and its own direct services. Although the balance between these elements was to change (most direct provision in the performing arts ceasing at the end of the war) they were to remain the basis for arts funding in Scotland into the 1990s, when the last vestiges of direct provision vanished.

Visual Art Policy

In December 1939 it was agreed that in the visual arts CEMA would achieve its aims through the extension of the Art for the People scheme. If the means to engage the widest public was the exhibition, then manifestly only the best work available should be presented. It would be wrong to conclude from this that popular participation in visual art was conceived of as passive consumption. Rather, because Art for the People was the (pre-ordained) vehicle for CEMA's visual work, an attempt was being made to encompass education, the stimulation of higher standards, the encouragement of individual practice and the creation of local arts groups.

Art for the People exhibitions had been tested over a period of years and the only uncertainty was over which places around Britain would prove most responsive. In early 1940, for example, Williams asked the SED for a report on the suitability of Inverurie as the first 'test bed' for his brainchild in Scotland. Volunteers who assisted at

BIAE exhibitions were often associated with local education committees, WEA branches, schools and art schools, which also provided organisational assistance. Guide and special lecturers were recruited to supplement the central pool retained by the BIAE and later CEMA. Local 'CEMA Committees' that sprang up independently of CEMA itself were also sources of local expertise and assistance.¹⁰ The approach was participatory as a matter of principle and necessity. The BIAE did not have the resources to provide a self-contained service, and would not have wished to. Of course, 'participation' was limited by the exhibitions available, one reason why the Scottish Committee wanted the capacity to make exhibitions of its own. The principle that demand must be expressed locally underpinned CEMA's determination that audiences should not be treated passively. Participation, in all its manifestations, was seen as another defence against state-approved art. This principle of local empowerment also helped support Scottish claims for a degree of autonomy under Keynes.

The exhibitions initially had a simple aim, to give public morale a lift. On a more strategic level, the exhibitions were undertaken to take visual art to parts of Britain where people had had little or no opportunity to see such work in the past, motivated by the belief in the role of art in educating citizens for modern democracy. Though to some extent permeated by Leavisite fears of 'substitute living' provoked by the rise of the media of popular culture, the predominant aim was to encourage making and 'appreciating' visual art as an individual and social good in itself. With guide lecturers in attendance to act as informed interlocutors, visitors could be encouraged to see modern work as having complex intellectual and expressive aims, rather than being simply mystifyingly botched attempts at visual description.

Policy and its Discontents

Policy is ultimately a matter of practice, which defines the effective policy if not the formal one. In 1940 and 1941 CEMA's activities in Scotland were defined by grants given to independent bodies, by the work of the art-form co-ordinators (meeting under the aegis of the Scottish Advisory Committee of the NCSS) and (gradually) activities organised directly by CEMA itself in London. This loose arrangement left the co-ordinators' informal committee with considerable freedom. Although direct evidence is lacking, H. Harvey Wood (the British Council's Scottish representative, who sat on the committee) left an insight into how it saw its role. Wood resigned when it was re-organised into the advisory committee chaired by Hyslop, giving as his reason that the new committee had no policy responsibilities. The point is clear: until then the Scottish co-ordinators had effectively made policy for Scotland in that they had decided how CEMA's general aims should be achieved, with minimal direction from London. That power had now been removed and the loss must surely have fed into the Scottish discontent with the centralising regime that was emerging, particularly after Keynes's appointment.

By the time the Scottish Committee was formed in early 1943, Keynes's values had largely supplanted the social vision of Jones. Mavor had no fundamental disagreement with Keynes about where the emphasis of policy must lie: art lived or died by the standards it set. Everything else fell in place behind that imperative. Writing sometime between 1943 and 1945, Mavor put his characteristic stamp on this outlook. Noting that CEMA's object was to encourage music and the arts, he continued:

That is to say, its first duties are to the arts themselves; its second duties are to the people for whose delight and instruction the Arts are created; its third duty, and only its third, is to the practitioner of the Arts. An art is not encouraged by third or fourth rate performances. It would probably be to the advantage of the art of painting, for instance, if CEMA had powers to commit bad painters to prison under some sort of 18B regulation. I say this because too many inferior artists seem to think that CEMA exists to perpetuate them in their employment for which they are unfitted.¹¹

Bloomsbury was not imposed on Scotland. Neither Keynes nor Mavor rejected widening public access as such, but it was not to be achieved from the dilution of standards. Even Tom Honeyman, who chafed most under London rule, did not dissent from the Keynesian order in that sense. This underscores the fact that Scottish disputes with London between 1943 and 1946 did not focus on CEMA's policy objectives, but were about operational control: practical policy on the ground.

The diffuse concept of 'policy' and its different components made for contention once national interests were involved. How and at what levels in an organisation is policy made? At what level does policy become action? Can action be policy, or how does it affect policy? Although action and policymaking are bound together, policy must begin from the ideas, beliefs and objectives of an individual or a collective. Policy is not wholly the product of reasoned analysis but emerges from the 'assumptive worlds' of its producers and may be unrecognised as policy for that reason.¹² CEMA's assumptive world changed as it evolved under Jones and Keynes, becoming less sensitive to claims for devolution of power. The assumptive world that the Scottish Committee shared with

Stanley Cursiter rested in part on the conviction, emotional as much as rational, that responsibility for CEMA's policy in Scotland must rest in Scotland. The visual arts shared in the ingrained Scottish suspicion of London-led initiatives. From the start the Scottish Committee believed itself to have policy-making powers, something CEMA was unwilling to concede because it threatened to open the way to eventual separation. But as the Scottish Committee gained leverage over the implementation of policy, it was gradually reclaiming what the early co-ordinators' committee had enjoyed, the power to interpret CEMA's policy objectives for Scottish conditions. An important example of this was ending direct London control of activities in Scotland by ensuring that these too came under its remit. From this position it was a short step to claiming full control of policy within Scotland, though still within the general objectives set by the Arts Council's Charter.

At the practical level of application, policy in Scotland was distinctive for several reasons. Many Scottish visual art institutions and organisations were long established and jealous defenders of their interests. Eight major galleries in Scotland took exhibitions from CEMA, and their curators were known professionally to one another. The two senior curators, in charge of the largest galleries, were Cursiter and Honeyman, both passionate defenders of Scotland's right to manage its own cultural affairs. By 1946, CEMA's high-handedness (and confusions caused by its cutting out the Scottish Committee whenever possible) had alienated most of the others.¹³ Scottish artists also needed opportunities to show and sell their work, opportunities that CEMA could not provide given its manifest lack of knowledge and interest. The artists were generally close to the curators through their various professional and social networks. They could provide the work and the curators the opportunities to ensure that the public in Scotland

could see it. Institutional hostility to CEMA's centralising approach was backed up by popular sentiment, which did not welcome any hint of London control (much as Robertson describes the NCSS encountering in the 1920s, but now in an increasingly nationalistic atmosphere). Finally, through the Kemps, the association between adult education networks and major galleries was closer than in the south. BIAE and Scottish Branch exhibitions were shown in art galleries as well as less formal venues from the start. Scottish Committee exhibitions followed suit, as did some of CEMA's. The Scottish Committee rejected the stricter division of labour that Keynes preferred as being unsuited to the smaller Scottish art-world.

The crucial problem of CEMA's policy was how to raise standards and widen access. In early 1940 Hetherington had foreseen where the difficulty lay: that long-term gains would come only from sustained work, not from CEMA's scattergun approach. Towards the end of that same year W. E. Williams was finding demand for exhibitions already outstripping supply, which brought the difficulty sharply into focus:

The dilemma which bedevils CEMA is whether to give as many towns as possible a once-over of art or whether to concentrate on fewer centres and give them a systematic 'course' of exhibitions.¹⁴

Williams adopted a military metaphor, arguing that while CEMA had "penetrated deep into new territories" it had not established "strong-points" and was not "holding the ground it has captured". Visual art had been more successful than drama or music because each exhibition stayed in one place usually for three weeks, making educational work more feasible, but even so it had not had a sustained impact. "Infiltration" was one

thing; what was needed was “consolidation”. He asked rhetorically whether “a dozen or so...strong points” should be set up “to demonstrate to the public (and the Treasury) the immensity of the cultural task which still awaits CEMA on a national scale?”¹⁵ Williams’s vision reveals its inheritance from *The 1919 Report* and his earlier work for the BIAE. These strong points were not civic arts centres of the sort that Keynes was soon to promote. Williams imagined them working “inside existing educational and social institutions” including public libraries, community centres and (as *The 1919 Report* had suggested for exhibitions) in Village Institutes. They would be the forerunners of others to follow. He concluded:

This type of CEMA strong-point is more desirable, to my mind, than the exclusive Arts Centre... The ‘Art Centre’ tends to attract only the initiated: we want the vulgar. By putting the arts into existing social and educational centres we give a basic ration to the uninitiated - which seems to me a more just and necessary policy than the issue of supplementary rations to the converted.¹⁶

Unless they were embedded in community institutions through which the BIAE (acting for CEMA) could engage new audiences, CEMA’s efforts would not achieve any lasting effect nor increase public interest in the arts. That Williams was aiming at a more integrated policy can be seen in his suggestion that, while the Carnegie UK Trust supported the amateur sector and CEMA educational work with professional artists, the two could be brought together in the same buildings. This vision would have appealed to Tom Jones because such centres were akin to the multi-purpose community centres that he had hoped to see develop out of the occupational clubs of the 1930s. The tide, however, was soon to turn against Williams with the appointment of Keynes, who had

little sympathy with this thinking.¹⁷ By 1943, in England and Wales CEMA was supplying exhibitions to galleries and the BIAE had returned to its original mission for ‘galleryless’ towns. Williams now likened his exhibitions to “small intruder patrols”, essentially hit-and-run operations.¹⁸ By the end of the war the BIAE had conceded that their exhibitions prepared the way for “the more advanced material from [the Arts Council]”.¹⁹ Although a developmental role, this was not what Williams had hoped for in 1941.²⁰

The Scottish Committee faced the same problem of how to effect some permanent influence in society. Mavor preferred a different metaphor:

CEMA has helped with a good deal of missionary work. But a mission has no hold on a savage area until it has built a Church, a School and a Hospital. The building of these structures must be done by native labour and partly by native capital. Our converts must not be allowed to sit still and allow themselves to be spoon-fed.²¹

In pointing out that nothing could be achieved without the involvement of Scots themselves, Mavor links policy to Scottish control. But he sees the cultural task in very much the same terms as Williams in the south. The cloud of ignorance that surrounds the few beacons of light has to be dispelled gradually by continuous effort. He wishes to acquaint people with the highest standards in the arts but not in the take-it-or-leave-it fashion of Keynes, who was dismissive of guide lecturers. Only through active engagement and education would any “converts” be held. Notwithstanding Mavor’s conviction that standards were primary, the Scottish Committee pursued a policy of

wide distribution. The range of productions that could be seen in Scottish venues encompassed one-person, group and thematic exhibitions, historical and contemporary work, work by Scottish and UK artists, and interpretative exhibitions. Some galleries and informal venues (including local libraries, halls and institutes which served various educational and leisure functions) would also have held amateur performances and exhibitions and some became more or less regular receivers. Regional ‘strong points’, then, embedded in Scottish communities, did exist to an extent, but as most would have functioned only sporadically as hosts for professional work the claim should not be over-stated.

The problem of the “once-over”, the isolated exhibition with no (or no early) follow-up, was an unavoidable difficulty. Scottish demographics shaped the efforts of the Scottish Branch and the Scottish Committee over the wartime years and afterwards. Exhibitions were, not surprisingly, seen most often in major conurbations and in larger towns. By contrast sparsely populated areas especially in the west and north received very little. Orkney and Shetland did better than the Hebrides. The Scottish Committee struggled to provide a truly national (Scottish) service, a struggle above all against limited resources. Perhaps its most obvious failure was to do little in the Gaidhealtachd, for which it was condemned by An Comunn Gaidhealach in 1943. Mavor’s contrite response was to appoint the Glasgow-based Gaelic scholar Neil Shaw (President of An Comunn Gaidhealach) to the Scottish Committee.

Despite this, the evidence shows that the Scottish Committee was not indifferent to the further parts of the country. Mavor’s vision for a national arts organisation was laid out in the Three Arts Council, his proposal of 1942 that, though hugely bureaucratic, would

have established a broadly based policy community including cultural, educational and economic bodies and regional interests. The six Regional Sub-committees would have covered the whole of the country and their directors would have formed one of the three Direction Committees immediately beneath the Three Arts Council itself. The inclusion of representatives of the Scottish Council for Art and Industry and the Scottish Development Council is more evidence of Mavor's synoptic vision. To permit these and other bodies representation on the Three Arts Council implied that it, in turn, might be represented on them and hence become thoroughly integrated into the structures of Scottish administration. This was the opposite of CEMA's isolationist stance.

Although Mavor was forced to withdraw this plan and to conform to the organisational structure of CEMA, ideas for a truly national policy-making base did not immediately disappear. The ferment of nationalist ideas at the time played a part. In 1945 Honeyman outlined his concept for the Scottish organisation he believed was needed. It would have a regional structure and be set in motion after a conference of arts and educational interests that would establish a national arts policy.²² Mavor did not repudiate this vision but, in the toils of conflict with Keynes, argued tactically (following Parker's line) that in an evolving situation it was better not to construct "a machine to beat the air" but to develop the functions and let the form follow. In the event, the Scottish Committee did not gain the independence that such a revolution would have required, and with the passing of the wartime nationalist wave such larger ambitions were lost. Throughout its history, the Scottish Committee remained a small body of people appointed for their individual expertise or general interest in the arts. It never sought to create a representative organisation with regional outposts, but confined itself to appointing art-

form sub-committees. Only from the 1970s did the Scottish Arts Council give sustained attention to initiatives outside the central belt.

Had Honeyman become Director for Scotland, something resembling his idea might conceivably have been pushed through, given that the Council after Keynes's death became weary of conflict with the Scots. But in early 1946, his nationalist colours were too well known in London for him to have been given the opportunity. Had either his or Mavor's organisations come into being arts policy in Scotland would surely have been different. One can only speculate, but it is likely that it would have better, and sooner, reflected Gaelic culture, traditional music and possibly literature, in Scots and dialect. Regional initiatives would probably have emerged earlier and education remained more central to arts policy than it did. It is even possible that the economic potential of the arts would have been examined long before *The Myerscough Report* (1988). However, central government funding would still have been paltry and there was little to encourage local authorities to spend significantly on the arts. Post-war austerity and other priorities for reconstruction would have taken their toll. Significant development would still have awaited the influx of new money in the 1960s.

¹ Shaw, op. cit. p. 53.

² Sampson, *Anatomy of Britain* (London, Hodder and Staughton, 1962), p.232.

³ *Helping Each Other in Time of Need* (section *Recreation and the Arts*), Labour Party, 1950.

⁴ Mavor to Parker, 13 April 1943, NAS ED 61/27.

⁵ *The Ayrshire Post*, 18 July 1945.

⁶ Notes of Meeting, 18 December 1939, NAS GD 281/51/2.

⁷ CEMA Progress Report, 25 January 1940, NAS GD 281/51/2.

⁸ The Case for the Treasury, March 1940, NAS GD 281/51/1/34.

⁹ The Arts Council of Great Britain, *Royal Charter*, 1946.

¹⁰ The first such committees in Scotland were set up in Montrose and Galashiels followed by Dundee, all in 1941 and all following Scottish Branch exhibitions (*The Scotsman*, 17 December 1941). At the inauguration of the Dundee committee, Grace Drysdale informed the gathering that local committees had to accept the selection of paintings made by the BIAE or Scottish Branch. The members of the local art committee in Dundee were Francis Cooper, Principal of Duncan of Jordanstone College, A. Nairne, John Needham, J. Milne Purvis, Angela Bradshaw and Annie Anderson (*The Dundee Courier*, 29 November 1941). One of the members of the Montrose committee was the painter Edward Baird. There were strong connections between the Montrose group and the WEA (Blackwood, *Portrait of a Young Scotsman; a life of Edward Baird, 1904-1949*, London, Fleming-Wyfold Art Foundation, 2004, pp. 65-66).

¹¹ Undated typescript (for a speech about theatre in Scotland), NLS Acc. 11039/35. Regulation 18B (1939) gave the Home Secretary powers to detain without trial any person whom he had reason to believe was of "hostile origin or association".

¹² 'Assumptive world' means the intermingling of values, beliefs, perceptions and intentions in the subjectivity of individuals who contribute to policymaking (Young, '*Values*' in *the policy process*, in Pollitt, et al (Eds.) *Public Policy in Theory and Practice* (London, Hodder and Stoughton and the Open University, 1979), pp. 31-41.

¹³ Fox to Mavor, 15 March 1946, NLS Acc. 11309/5.

¹⁴ Williams, 1940 Report, BIAE Executive Committee Minute Book, 1930-1946, NIACE.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ The idea did not disappear. In 1944 James discussed CEMA's model for an arts centre (an enthusiasm of Keynes's) with the Museums Association. This makes it clear that the arts centre could be interpreted in different ways: "The model has the blessing of the Ministry of Education Community Centres Committee... In other words it will be regarded as suitable for those community centres, parts of which have to be used for school purposes, notably of course, the main hall. On the other hand, where a locality can provide its own funds to erect an art centre, the model will still serve" (James to Wilkie, 4 September 1944, NAS GD 281/51/3). In 1947 the SED discussed with the Scottish Committee the Arts Council's policy of giving capital but not revenue grants for arts centres. This created a situation in which other departments, such as the SED or SHD, might be expected to provide revenue grants without having been involved in the process. Arts centres were "a specialised form of community centre and the community centre provision in every large town or reasonably wide rural area should include facilities of the Arts Centre type". The Arts Council should look at Education Authorities' schemes for community centres (Dand to Fox, 2 May 1947, NAS ED 61/28, and subsequent correspondence). The desire was to have an integrated approach: "we should seek to avoid anything which tends to segregate the people interested in the arts and cultural activities from other sections of the community. Possibilities of arousing an interest in these matters in larger numbers of the population by the infection of contact with those already interested in the arts is essential to a wide-spreading scheme of Further Education. I am afraid that the development of "Arts Centres" [i.e. specialised centres] may hinder this possibility" (Dand to Parker, 12 May 1947, NAS ED 61/27).

¹⁸ BIAE Art Sub-Committee Minute Book, 9 November 1943, NIACE.

¹⁹ BIAE Annual Report, 1946, p. 10.

²⁰ In the 1950s, as Secretary General, Williams was to be the champion of the Arts Council's 'few but roses' policy.

²¹ Undated typescript for a speech about theatre in Scotland, NLS Acc. 11039/35.

²² Honeyman's plan is discussed in Volume One, Part Four, 'Mavor and Honeyman's Debate'.

Chapter 15: Visual Art Activities, 1940-47

A greater glory beckons us
CEMA has played its part
Supremely wise it reckons us
Brechin stands first in art!

Dundee, Montrose, Forfar, Thrums
Suffer from loss of face
Sound the loud trumpet, beat the drums
Brechin has pride of place!

W.G. Burns, *The Greater Glory*, 1945¹

My objective in this section is to ground my earlier discussion of policy in the actual practice that emerged and developed in Scotland between 1940 and 1947. Any assessment of CEMA's and the Arts Council's success or failure ultimately rests on the practical work carried out in their name. The data presented here and in the tables in Appendix Two are collected from a variety of sources including annual reports and internal documents. No single list of exhibitions and showings survives if such ever existed, and the data must be regarded as incomplete and approximate (even in annual reports there are minor discrepancies). It is not invariably clear which body produced which exhibition, and this extends to bodies that may occasionally have produced exhibitions with assistance or support from CEMA or the BIAE.² Uncertainty even arises from the titles of exhibitions which were not always scrupulously used. It is possible, for example, that *Modern Paintings* (1941-42) and *Modern Painting and Sculpture* (1943) are the same exhibition, as might be *Original Prints* and *Original Contemporary Prints* (both of 1943).

I have judged that they were probably different, and have counted them separately. Research has also been complicated because CEMA and BIAE records do not consistently distinguish between ‘exhibition’ and ‘showing’ which later became standard Arts Council terminology. ‘Exhibition’ was used with two meanings, as a discrete collection of objects displayed together, and as any public presentation of such a collection. Uncertainty about the true number of exhibitions circulated during these years is one consequence. ‘Exhibition’ is used here to refer only to the first sense above, and ‘showing’ to the second. Exhibitions, usually intended for touring, most commonly had more than one showing. The same exhibitions were often shown over successive years. I conclude the analysis in March 1946 because the records for 1946-47 do not differentiate sufficiently between exhibitions shown in Scotland and those shown elsewhere. From 1947-48 onwards, more reliable records were kept.

Exhibitions Overview, 1940-46

Working with these limitations and excluding exhibitions of reproductions, I count a total of 48 identifiably different (‘new’) exhibitions shown in Scotland between April 1940 and March 1946. These 48 exhibitions had a total of at least 203 showings (Tables 1 and 2). The approximate dates of showings are given (precise dates exist for many but are unnecessary here) along with the title of the exhibition and the venues and centres when known. Each annual table concludes with the total number of exhibitions shown in Scotland and the identifiably number of new exhibitions, the minimum number of showings, and the numbers of identifiably different venues and centres. The figure for total showings includes nine counties in which venues and centres cannot be identified but which are counted as one showing each, being the logical minimum. Four other locations are mentioned with insufficient detail to identify even the general

geographical area. They also are counted as one showing each. The total number of showings in Scotland therefore must have been higher than given here. In 1945 Ellen Kemp recorded that in the nine months from April to December showings were averaging seven per month. If this were maintained over the whole year, the total would have been 84 showings.³ I have been able to identify only 46. Kemp's figures may have included showings of reproductions, but they still suggest that my tally for 'main' showings is lower than the true figure. It would be modest to assume that over the seven-year period there were about another 25 to 30 main exhibition showings not recorded here, but even an estimate of about 230 showings may well be too low.

Whenever possible I have identified the institutions in which the exhibitions were shown ('venues') and the cities, towns or smaller communities ('centres') where the venues were located. Where exhibitions were sent to ordnance factories, armed service units and dockyards, CEMA bulletins tended not to name them for security reasons. Occasionally these places can be identified from internal documents. In other cases, the destinations of exhibitions are given in the most general terms (e.g. Argyllshire or Aberdeenshire) without centres or venues being named. I count a total of 85 identifiably different venues in 58 identifiably different centres. These again are minimum figures and the true totals would have been higher.⁴ Exhibitions were seen from Stranraer in the south to Shetland in the north, Aberdeen in the east to Stornoway in the west. As any contemporary exhibition-organiser would attest, these figures represent an impressive achievement, the more so with few staff and against a background of limited resources and wartime conditions.

Separate exhibitions of original works and of reproductions were in circulation at the same time. Sets of reproductions (some having as many as 60 images) included both historical and recent work, ranging from Old Masters such as Breughel to contemporary work, as in *What is Modern Painting?* (a small exhibition on portable screens originating from the Museum of Modern Art, New York and toured, surprisingly, only to schools in Banffshire). Reproductions were generally sent to factory and other canteens, youth clubs and similar places. Original works were sent to art galleries, but also to halls, libraries and other places including occasionally canteens and youth clubs. Reproductions were low-cost expedients to reach as wide a public as possible, but many exhibitions of original work, particularly those of the BIAE, were not treated with the curatorial finesse of today. In contrast, as CEMA's ambitions as a provider of major exhibitions grew, some exhibitions of high-value works (for example, from the collections of the Tate and the Walker Art Galleries) were only made available to selected art galleries which met minimum environmental standards. Yet despite this trend, in 1944 an exhibition drawn from the Wyndham Vint collection was sent by CEMA to Orkney and shown elsewhere in minor venues.

Of the 48 new exhibitions, 12 were produced for the BIAE, 13 for its Scottish Branch, 15 for CEMA/Arts Council and six for the Scottish Committee.⁵ The British Council organised two, which are counted here. *The Art of the Allies* (1941) was organised by the British Council's Scottish office, seemingly the initiative of H. Harvey Wood, when he was a member of the Scottish Advisory Committee of the NCSS and closely involved in CEMA's developing activities in Scotland. The exhibition was subsequently adapted and toured by CEMA in England and Wales. The British Council was also

responsible for bringing the *Picasso and Matisse* exhibition to Britain in 1946, which was toured by the Arts Council.

Over all, BIAE and Scottish Branch productions account for over half (52%) of all new exhibitions shown in Scotland over the seven-year period.⁶ They were even more dominant before 1943-44. CEMA only became active as a provider of exhibitions in 1942 and its presence was not really felt in Scotland until 1943. The Scottish Committee became active in 1944, and in the final two years considered here produced a quarter of the new exhibitions in Scotland.⁷ The exact division between the BIAE and the Scottish Branch is somewhat uncertain, and one exhibition, *Drawings and Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists*, may have been organised by the Scottish Committee.⁸

About 17% of all new British exhibitions between 1940 and 1945 were seen in Scotland.⁹ The exceptionally high 1941-42 figure of 39% may be explained by strong production activity in Scotland that year (counting *The Art of the Allies*) while the English and Welsh total seemingly remained almost static, but the southern figure may be underestimated. Thereafter, the total British figures grow substantially while the Scottish level continues at around 15% of the total. In population terms, Scotland appears to have been better served than England and Wales, given that one might have expected about ten exhibitions in the south for every one in Scotland. The relative over-supply is accounted for by exhibitions produced in Scotland for Scotland adding to exhibitions brought from the south. Scotland, it seems, benefited from its position as both part of, but different from, the rest of Britain. Between 1940 and 1945, the proportion of Scottish-produced exhibitions to the British total averaged about 12%, or

if the 1941-42 figure is discounted, just over 7% which may be more plausible.¹⁰ If Scottish-produced exhibitions shown in Scotland are removed, the figures show an average of 8% to 9% of London-produced new exhibitions being brought to Scotland over these years. Scottish productions accounted for 51% of the exhibitions shown in Scotland over five years, a figure that proves that the Scottish organisations were very active. However, it appears that exhibition production continued to grow strongly in the south after 1943-44, which it did not in Scotland. There was only so much 'product' that the relatively few major Scottish galleries and towns could take compared to the scope for growth in England and Wales.

Although Scotland seems to have had a slightly higher proportion of exhibitions than might have been expected, the number of showings suggests a different story. CEMA recorded the total number of BIAE and CEMA showings (excluding those of reproductions) in Britain between April 1940 and March 1945.¹¹ Over that period, Scotland averaged 8% of total showings (157 of the total 1,918) although that proportion varies year by year from less than 4% in 1940 to 19% the following year. If the latter figure is set aside (as being suspiciously high) the average is barely over 7%. That Scotland hosted a higher proportion of exhibitions than of showings correlates with tours being generally shorter than in the south. Philip James used this in 1945 to argue that Scottish tours were less economically viable, and around the same time the Scottish Committee noted a trend to offer fewer exhibitions to Scotland.¹²

The effect in Scotland of CEMA's (and the Scottish Committee's) emergence as exhibition producers is shown in Tables 7 and 8. Between 1940 and 1946, the BIAE's and Scottish Branch's 25 exhibitions achieved 144 showings. CEMA's and the Scottish

Committee's 21 scored 57 showings. So, although the BIAE and Scottish Branch presented a small majority of exhibitions they secured an average of 71% of all showings.¹³ This dominance is explained by the relative concentration of CEMA exhibitions mainly on one or two gallery showings, while the other bodies exploited the full range of opportunities open to them. With its mission to take work to smaller towns and communities, the BIAE can be seen to have contributed a great deal to the geographical range achieved in these years.¹⁴ From its monopoly position in the first two years, the BIAE/Scottish Branch share of Scottish showings declined more or less steadily until 1946, when they and CEMA/Scottish Committee were providing almost equal numbers. The more interesting point is that they were able to hold such a powerful position within the field even then, given Keynes's desire to reduce their role.

It would seem that the sometimes earnestly educational quality of BIAE exhibitions was not an inhibition in securing exhibition venues at all levels, and this helped its position in Scotland.¹⁵ The Scottish Branch itself secured between 58% and 61% of the BIAE's showings in Scotland.¹⁶ On CEMA's side the Scottish Committee, in two years from 1944, notched up 49% of their total. This is impressive evidence of both Scottish organisations' success in promoting exhibitions that found a ready response from the Scottish target market. The Scottish Branch, William MacTaggart (for the BIAE) and the Scottish Committee together produced 16 exhibitions with particularly Scottish content (33% of all exhibitions in Scotland). They accounted for 106 identifiable showings (52% of the Scottish total). This exposes a strong desire on the part of Scottish institutions (large and small) to make people more aware of Scottish visual art. These exhibitions were more often aimed at both gallery and non-specialist venues than at galleries alone, and the clear purpose was to take Scottish work to the Scottish

people. But what was offered was not a wholly insular diet. Many of the exhibitions that were predominantly Scottish were not entirely so, and just under half of showings in Scotland were of exhibitions that had no, or were not built around, Scottish content. This demonstrates that Scottish institutions were not narrowly nationalistic in their choice of exhibitions. There was of course no access to new material from outside the UK until 1945, making all the exhibition-producers dependent on British sources.

A breakdown of exhibitions by content shows that painting was the dominant visual art form.¹⁷ Twenty-two exhibitions (46% of the total) were of recent or contemporary painting (or predominantly painting: many included drawings or prints and some included sculpture). These 22 account for 104 identifiable showings (51% of the total). The dominance of painting was even stronger than this suggests, because a further five exhibitions exclusively or mainly of historical paintings (10%) account for another 18 showings (9%). Sculpture is named only once in an exhibition title, but even then was cohabiting with painting, as it did in at least one other. In total, paintings were present in 56% of all exhibitions and 60% of all showings in Scotland. The explanation for this preponderance is partly practical, paintings being relatively easy to transport compared to sculpture, but more importantly it reflects its dominance among artists and its high status. In contrast, six printmaking exhibitions (13%) account for only 13 (6%) of identifiable Scottish showings. This is almost certainly an underestimate. In 1944 Ellen Kemp recorded that *Oriental Prints* would be sent to “a large number of factory canteens, Women’s Land Army hostels etc.”¹⁸ Only one such venue is identifiable.

Even so, the apparent failure to make more of printmaking seems surprising as (for example) Williams in early 1940 had purchased a collection of about 200 prints

precisely to have a ready and economical source of exhibitions. The absence is to some extent exaggerated, prints certainly being present in some exhibitions nominally of paintings, and probably included in others. However, printmaking was not then as widely practised among Scottish artists as it was after the 1960s. Between the wars relief printing and lithography were commonly (though not exclusively) associated in art school teaching with design (including illustration) rather than fine art, with which etching and engraving were aligned. The number of serious fine art printmakers was relatively small. Also, the depression had undermined the market for contemporary printmaking in the 1930s, and production was probably still low when war arrived.

Seven exhibitions of design-related subjects (15%) were held, with 18 identifiable showings (9%). CEMA produced four with eight showings, and the BIAE three with ten showings. Several had only one showing in Scotland, and only the BIAE's *Design in Daily Life* (1944-45) had a longish Scottish tour, of at least eight showings. CEMA always intended to circulate applied design and craft exhibitions, but its bias towards fine art explains their relatively small number. Most were produced between 1944 and 1946, however, which suggests that the impending creation of the Design Council did not inhibit production. Between 1941 and 1943, three exhibitions (6%) of town planning were produced, a subject of contemporary importance for post-war reconstruction. Despite their small number they achieved a minimum of 26 showings (13% of total showings) which demonstrates wide public interest. The BIAE's and the Scottish Branch's planning exhibitions account for all but one of the identifiable showings. The exception was CEMA's *Rebuilding Britain* (1943) which had little relevance to Scottish town planning, architecture and building materials. Despite being

(slightly) adapted at the insistence of the Scottish Committee, its single Scottish venue was the showroom of the local gas company in Greenock.

The final category, which I have called 'Interpretative', includes three exhibitions (6%) with a minimum of 17 identifiable showings (8%). *The Present Discovers the Past* was an archaeological exhibition, and the Warburg Institute's *English Art and the Mediterranean* a scholarly exhibition based on documentary photographs predominantly of architecture and sculpture. Both had one showing each, in Glasgow and Dundee respectively. The third, *The Artist at Work*, existed in two forms, as a gallery exhibition and as a small version for local venues based on photographs and circulated on panels. The main exhibition had six showings and the small version at least nine up to April 1946.

Perhaps the most striking omission to contemporary eyes is the absence of photography as an art form. It appears (in Scotland at least) only as a means to other ends, to reproduce original works and to provide documentary content, as in *English Art and the Mediterranean*, *The Artist at Work* and *Living in Cities*. Was this a case of conservative blinkers denying it the status of art? It is curious that neither its accessibility nor popularity, nor the history of photography in Scotland, prompted its inclusion.¹⁹

Gallery Exhibitions

Scotland had eight major art galleries that took exhibitions more or less often, and played an important part in enabling the BIAE and CEMA to mount a sustained effort to influence popular understanding of art.²⁰ Aberdeen Art Gallery and Dundee Art Gallery were the most active receivers of exhibitions, recording 12 each (25% of all

exhibitions; 6% of all showings, each). The National Galleries in Edinburgh (despite the conflict with Cursiter) held 11 (23% of all exhibitions; 5% of all showings). Next come Paisley Art Gallery with eight (17% of all exhibitions; 4% of all showings) and Glasgow Art Gallery (Kelvingrove) with seven (15% of all exhibitions; 3% of all showings). Perth Art Gallery was quite active later in the war, with five (10% of all exhibitions; 2% of all showings), as was the Dick Institute, Kilmarnock, with four (8% of all exhibitions; 2% of all showings). Bringing up the rear was Kirkcaldy Art Gallery, which took only one exhibition. Table 13 lists the identifiable exhibitions taken by each of the eight.

Thirty-four (71%) of the 48 identifiable exhibitions were shown in these galleries, accounting for 60 showings (30%).²¹ CEMA exhibitions would be expected to account for a higher proportion of major centre showings as opposed to minor centres, and they do, while BIAE exhibitions tended to have a wider range. Sixteen exhibitions (33%) were gallery-only, with 30 showings (16% of all showings; 50% of gallery showings).²² Only one BIAE and one Scottish Branch exhibition are among them, the latter being the large version of *The Artist at Work* (1943-44). The remaining two, *The McInnes Collection* and *Contemporary Swedish Painting* (both 1945-46) were associated with the Scottish Committee.²³ Together these had 13 showings. Thirteen of the exhibitions (27%) were CEMA productions, with 17 showings (8% of all showings; 28% of gallery showings). This emphasises the extent of CEMA's concentration on gallery exhibitions, and their brief appearances in Scotland. Only one, *Ballet Design* (1944-45), had as many as three showings. Gallery exhibitions naturally included most of CEMA's major historical exhibitions and some contemporary ones. That well over two-thirds of

Scottish showings were held in smaller centres emphasises the relative success of the effort to take exhibitions outside the main population centres.

Geographical Range

How extensive was the reach of CEMA and the BIAE in Scotland? Table 15 lists the identifiable centres across Scotland where exhibitions were held. Table 16 lists counties where exhibitions were shown, but centres and venues not recorded. Table 17 gives venues that cannot be identified with any geographic location, and Table 18 identifiable armed services camps and bases that took exhibitions. A minimum of 14 identifiable showings (about 7% of all showings) were held in army and RAF camps, AA and ATS units, and army education centres (including Newbattle Abbey College), though the true figure would have been higher.²⁴ As they were presumably not generally accessible to the public, I have excluded these showings from the analysis below. Table 19 relates showings to estimated populations of burghs and counties.²⁵ Finally, Table 20 gives counties that seem not to have been visited by any exhibitions.

Exhibitions were most common in the south of Scotland and areas of the central belt, in towns from Fife to the counties of Aberdeen, Banff and Inverness, with some reaching north to Ross and Cromarty, Caithness, Orkney and Shetland. Almost nothing reached the west, north of the Clyde basin. The pattern of course conforms to the demographics of Scottish population. The largest number of showings was naturally held in the central belt, with 36 for example in Glasgow, Paisley and Clydebank, heavily populated as they were with busy war industries and docks. Ayrshire had 16, and another 21 were held in Edinburgh and Midlothian. The north-east from Kincardine and Aberdeen to Banff had 27, closely followed by Angus (including Dundee) with 25. The Borders, from

Eyemouth to Stranraer, had 18 showings and Fife 13. Inverness-shire and Perth had six and eight respectively. Argyll, Ross and Cromarty and Caithness, with small population centres, had six. No exhibitions, for example, are recorded in this period in Oban or Fort William, while Stornoway received one, and Wick and Thurso one each. Orkney did somewhat better with five, perhaps because of the population of service personnel stationed there. Shetland received only two (both planning exhibitions, both shown in 1942). The size of population centres, demand coming from places themselves, transport, the need to get a reasonable return on expenditure, and insurance risks were obviously issues that influenced the range and frequency of showings. Even so, if the relative paucity of activity over seven years in the west and north is striking, perhaps more surprising is the near absence of the counties of Stirling and (discounting Glasgow) Lanark. Motherwell and Hamilton, for example, are absent. Several counties, seemingly, had no exhibitions, including Kirkcudbright, East and West Lothian, and Moray.

The frequency of exhibition showings, however, is best judged in relation to population. The figures I use in Table 19 are taken from the 1931 Census of Scotland. No census was taken in 1941 because of the war. Population changes caused by national service and war work must have been significant, but lacking relevant data I use the 1931 figures. The results, then, should be treated as approximations only. One consequence is that in smaller counties with populations of less than 100,000 (for example, the Borders counties, Kincardine, Banff, Inverness, Ross and Cromarty, Caithness, Orkney and Shetland) the percentage of showings held was greater than their population share. Conversely, Lanarkshire (including Glasgow) had a much lower proportion of showings to population share: 12% to nearly 33% respectively. This was true, though not so

starkly, of Midlothian (including Edinburgh) where the ratio is about 8% to 11%. Smaller places, then, did relatively better from the limited exhibitions available than did the largest, most densely populated, centres. Statistically, this is of course much easier to achieve. Glasgow would have had to have 48 showings, twice its actual total, to match Stirling's one. The point is underlined by the statistics for the eight cities that took major gallery exhibitions.²⁶ Considering the number of exhibitions in relation to population places Perth at the top of the list, followed by Kilmarnock, Paisley, Dundee, Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Kirkcaldy and Glasgow. The smaller cities tend more easily to achieve a higher ratio, for example Kirkcaldy's one exhibition allows it to surpass Glasgow. Of the larger cities of over 100,000 population, Dundee emerges as the clear 'winner' with about 8% of exhibitions for less than 4% of the Scottish population.

The larger counties (with populations of over 100,000) that did proportionately very well were Ayr, Renfrew, Angus and Aberdeen. Their 32% of showings equated with about 24% of the Scottish population. Dunbarton and Fife also did well, with showings and population shares that (given the margin for error) were closely matched. The county that by did by far the best was Angus, including Dundee, which had over 12% of Scottish showings and less than 6% of the Scottish population. Taking Angus together with Fife, Kincardine, Aberdeen and Banff shows that despite having only 16% of the Scottish population they had approximately 40% of showings. This strong demand made the east and north-east the jewel in the crown for CEMA in Scotland.

Despite the limitations of geographical range and the infrequency of exhibitions in most places, the data show that, imperfect though it was, an active programme of what would now be called 'outreach' was underway. Only about 6% of the Scottish population lived

in counties where no exhibitions were shown. The tables of course show very clearly the difficulty of providing more than one-off or very occasional exhibitions in smaller centres, a problem that the organisers were well aware of. However, many of the centres identified here also took exhibitions in the following 20 and more years, and between 1947 and 1967 were joined by another 44 different centres, bringing the total of receiving centres in Scotland to 112. Some of the wartime centres then appear fairly often, and only a few in the longer run appear only once. An annual Arts Council exhibition became quite common in some places. In a few, more than one per year were occasionally held. Such sustained local interest may reflect the enthusiasm of (for example) an education committee, an active art club, an individual artist, museum curator or librarian. This could explain why centres active at one time disappear later. The data presented here, then, should be seen as the initial phase of a longer development programme, and during this time over half of what effectively became a network of receiving venues was created.

Schools as Venues

Schools grew in importance as venues for exhibitions of original works over the period. Between 1940 and 1946 a total of 19 schools (22% of identifiable venues) presented 25 showings (12%) of 12 exhibitions (26%).²⁷ Most schools showed only one exhibition, but Mackie Academy (Stonehaven), Galashiels Academy, Dumfries Academy and Brechin High School hosted two each and Bell Baxter High School, Cupar, hosted three. The total numbers of schools and showings are almost certainly underestimated. It is very possible that among the unidentified centres in Argyllshire and Aberdeenshire, where the 1943 exhibition of lithographs was shown, were some school halls. The reference to Aberdeenshire towns and villages, Banffshire and Angus in relation to

Design in Daily Life (1944), which was shown in the Gordons School, Huntly, probably conceals other school halls. The absence of any schools used during 1941-42 seems suspicious. The predominance of schools in the borders and the east of Scotland is marked, and matches the larger pattern of exhibition distribution. Most of the schools were in smaller towns (for example, Kelso, Falkirk, Keith, Dingwall and Thurso) where school halls were used as public halls. In cities and larger towns public galleries and halls were generally available. Given the principle that exhibitions should be provided only where demand had been expressed, it would seem that local education committees or teachers contacted the BIAE or the Scottish Committee when made aware of the available exhibitions. The absence of other schools may reflect lack of awareness of the scheme or lack of interest.

What sort of exhibitions did schools take?²⁸ Seven were of painting (or predominantly painting), two were of printmaking, two were design-related and one was interpretative (*The Artist at Work*). Only one, *19th Century Scottish Painting*, was historical, which reflects the fact that most such exhibitions were made for art galleries. On the other hand, the remaining six were of recent and contemporary work, as were the print and design exhibitions, making ten out of the total 12. Five of the 12 were exhibitions of Scottish painting. Although CEMA was not empowered to make exhibitions specifically for schoolchildren, pupils were encouraged to visit exhibitions shown in their school hall. Williams estimated that 130,000 schoolchildren across Britain had visited BIAE exhibitions in 1940-41. This suggests why the work of CEMA and the BIAE merited a mention in the Sixth Advisory Council's 1943 report on citizenship.

Exhibitions, 1946-47

As noted above, 1946-47 is excluded from the data because the Arts Council's annual report for that year makes no distinction between exhibitions shown in Scotland and those shown elsewhere in Britain. Also, the Council did not produce bulletins as CEMA had done. Working from internal documents I have identified only 11 exhibitions that must have been shown in Scotland, and have some information about seven. Five (*The McInnes Collection*, *The Scottish Modern Art Association* first collection, *The Artist at Work* (small version), *Drawings and Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists* and *The RSA 1945 Selection*) were continuing tours begin in earlier years. Six new exhibitions are identifiable, but I have no reliable information about three, *Paintings from the Burrell Collection*, *The RSA 1946 Selection* and *The Society of Scottish Artists 1946 Selection*. The remaining three were *French Painting, Sculpture and Book Illustration*, *The Scottish Modern Art Association* second collection, and *Contemporary Paintings by Edinburgh and Glasgow Artists*. A minimum of 27 showings was achieved, in 17 different venues in 19 different centres. Among the venues, six schools are named or alluded to.²⁹ Because this list is so incomplete I have left it out of the analysis presented above.

Exhibitions of Reproductions, 1940-46

References (in CEMA Bulletins and other documents) to exhibitions of reproductions are given in Table 24. The exact numbers of sets of reproductions and showings, and of centres and venues, are not verifiable because records are fragmentary. It seems unlikely, for example, that any set of reproductions had only one or two showings, as my information suggest for some. What is certain is that the exhibitions were shown in such places as factory recreation areas and canteens, British Restaurants, youth clubs,

hostels, schools, Civil Defence centres, and armed services education centres. On the available evidence, schools took only two exhibitions of reproductions. One, in 1941, is recorded in Stonehaven without an identified venue but which was most likely Mackie Academy. The other, *What is Modern Painting?* (1945) was shown only in schools, all in Banffshire.³⁰ Only one was shown in an art gallery (Paisley, in 1942). Some venues appear more than once. Bilsland Brothers (Glasgow), Rolls Royce (Hillington) and the Royal Ordnance Factories at Bishopton and Cardonald took exhibitions of reproductions. Exhibitions of reproductions included sets of Old Masters and, as some titles reveal, more recent work (such as *American Painting* and *What is Modern Painting?*). Another, the BIAE's *Accent on Colour*, seems to have been design-related. It also seems that because it was impossible during the war to bring examples of the work from abroad to Britain, reproductions were used to fill that gap.³¹

In April 1940 the BIAE had two sets in circulation.³² By May there were four, and an agreement to increase the number to eight.³³ In an undated paper of 1940 a figure of 220 reproductions in CEMA's possession is given, but without other details.³⁴ A year later, another paper gives a figure of 1,200 reproductions, again without further detail.³⁵ The first figure suggests perhaps four to six sets, while the second would have been enough for 20 sets of 60 images. A group of 100 Breughel reproductions were seemingly circulated as four sets of 25 images.³⁶ Later, in 1945-46, the BIAE recorded that 204 sets were circulating in Britain, implying that several thousand reproductions had been amassed.³⁷ Sets probably had a long working life. Frames were no doubt damaged from time to time, but easily repaired and the sets sent out again. The earliest sets were likely to have still been in circulation in 1945. Also, colour reproductions would have been less expensive to buy in bulk, and may have been organised in multiple identical sets.

Despite these glimpses, available data suggest that only about 20 different sets of reproductions were circulated in Scotland over the seven years from 1940 to 1946.³⁸ In any one year two to three sets are identifiable, rising to five in 1945-46. Two factors other than fragmentary records compromise the reliability of this figure. First, some sets must have been circulated from one year to another and, because definite descriptions are missing, could well have been counted twice. On the other hand some of these may conceal what were in reality several sets, hence underestimating the true figure. CEMA gives a figure of 37 showings of reproductions in 29 centres for 1940-41.³⁹ Had Scotland's share been 8% of these then three showings would be expected, but at least four are identifiable. Whatever the true picture, this suggests that there were not many sets in circulation at this stage.

If the BIAE's 1945 figure of 204 sets is taken, and assuming that Scotland had 8% of these, it would suggest that about 15 sets should have been in circulation towards the end of the war. Could there have been about ten entirely unrecorded sets? Although the purpose of CEMA bulletins was to inform its regional organisers and political masters of the activities it promoted, they were not scrupulously detailed and reproductions were not given much attention. Perhaps Scotland did have proportionately fewer sets than England and Wales, possibly explained by the concentration of wartime industry in the south, but this hardly seems enough to account for such a difference. Sixty-five showings implies that each of the approximately 20 sets in Scotland had on average only about three showings. This seems a low figure for exhibitions that were intended to have multiple venue tours. It may be that a significant number of venues, and possibly of sets, remain unidentified. But their numbers cannot be guessed at.

Exhibitions and Artists

The exhibitions were above all educational, intended to instruct the public and stimulate practice as much as to provide pleasure. The scepticism of Keynes and Clark about guide lecturers should not obscure CEMA's commitment. It and the BIAE were engaged (if with different emphases) in a great effort of public education in the arts, and it is from this perspective, rather than an art-historical one, that I wish to evaluate their achievement in Scotland. From the data given above, the general range of the exhibitions is apparent. Although photography was neglected and painting predominant, the several organisations produced a body of exhibitions that in total was creditably broad, especially so given the practical difficulties of the early years.

Although some exhibitions included prints and paintings dating from the 16th to the 18th centuries, the large majority presented 19th and (even more often) 20th century work. The broad thrust of most was that which had motivated Williams to begin the Art for the People series: to elucidate the origins and development of modern art, and particularly modern British art. CEMA itself produced historical exhibitions (not least because of its connections with the national collections in London) but, because supporting contemporary art was fundamental to its purpose, the seeming favouring of modernism occasionally drew fire from traditionalist circles. Modernism was then often associated with socialism and traditionalism with toryism whatever the actual opinions of the artists. In 1944 for example, some Royal Academicians, among them the Scots D.Y. Cameron and Sir John Stirling Maxwell, accused CEMA (in *The Times*) of subversion. Not only was CEMA founded with a utopian hope that art would help repair social divisions, but the exhibition programme as a whole had to continually demonstrate a non-partisan ethos. Writing of the Scottish Modern Art Association's first

touring collection, Mavor set out the ethos of a cautiously progressive Scottish culture, which also shows that his sceptical turn of mind had insulated him from the ontological optimism of Idealist social theory. He sided with the older tradition of Scottish philosophy:

To the red eye of the Left, [the exhibition] may show a tinge of conservatism, though most of the artists represented were revolutionaries in their day. On the other hand it should appeal to the characteristic Scottish mind and eye. Scotland has been bred on a realist philosophy and on a respect for craftsmanship for its own sake. Her record of experiment in material and spiritual fields safeguards her against the charge of undue conservatism.⁴⁰

Who, then, were the artists seen in Scotland during these years? To provide an overview, I first discuss exhibitions that brought artists to Scotland, as evidence of the wider interests of Scottish galleries. Then I look more specifically at Scottish artists shown in the same period. The exhibitions shown by Scottish venues were of course dominated by painting. Only two one-person exhibitions were shown. The 1943 retrospective, *Philip Wilson Steer*, (Steer having died in 1942) included 29 oil paintings and 30 watercolours, and was shown in the National Galleries in Edinburgh and Aberdeen Art Gallery.⁴¹ The following year Perth Art Gallery showed *Paul Nash: Applied Design*, 64 works dating from 1908 to 1942, including book illustration, wood engravings, typographic decorations, textile design, watercolours and oil paintings, the aim being to place his work as a designer in the context of his paintings. According to Philip James the exhibition was intended to encourage “not show off” individual talent: a distinct echo of CEMA’s original ethos. Exhibitions drawn from private and public

collections formed the rest. Of the latter, two were from the Tate Gallery, one being *British Narrative Painting* “from Stothard and Mulready to the Pre-Raphaelites and the illustrators of the ‘sixties’”.⁴² The other was the selection of wartime acquisitions, shown in the National Gallery of Scotland and Kelvingrove in 1943. The catalogue contained a patriotic declaration by the Tate’s director, John Rothenstein. With much of the continent occupied, British painters [sic] he wrote, “have become the chief custodians of the great artistic traditions of free Europe”, and concluded with the optimistic hope that after the war British art would assume a central rather than peripheral position in the European tradition. The collection ranged from Jean-Jacques Tissot and William Nicholson, to the Camden Town painters Gore, Ginner and Gilman, to Sickert, Sir John Lavery and J. D. Innes. Younger contemporaries included Augustus and Gwen John, David Jones, Henry Moore, Ivon Hitchens, Stanley Spencer, Ben and Winifred Nicholson, Graham Sutherland and Victor Pasmore. James Pryde was the one Scot included. Work by Cézanne, Toulouse-Lautrec, Vuillard and Utrillo widened the range beyond Britain.⁴³

This list of British artists is indicative of those represented in various contemporary and mixed collections. A pool of British artists appears, in various combinations in different exhibitions. *The CEMA Collection*, shown in 1943 in Dundee and much criticised by the Scottish Committee, was introduced with the proviso that it did not pretend “to be representative of modern British art”. Seventy-five artists were represented. Among them were John Armstrong, Vanessa Bell, James Fitton, Charles Ginner, Lawrence Gowing, Duncan Grant, Ivon Hitchens, Percy Horton, Bernard Meninsky, Rodrigo Moynihan, Victor Pasmore, Ceri Richards, Kenneth Rowntree, Ruskin Spear, Sir George Clausen, Claude Rogers, Gilbert Spencer, John Tunnard, Leonard Rosomon,

Carel Weight, Edward Burra, Frances Hodgins and Kenneth Martin. Four Scots had by now been mustered to deflect the criticisms of 1942: Robert Colquhoun, Kirkland Jamieson, William Gillies and John Maxwell.

Arnold Haskell's exhibition *Ballet Design*, shown in Edinburgh, Dundee and Aberdeen in 1944 included international figures such as Leon Bakst, Alexandre and Nadia Benois, André Derain, Nathalie Goncharova, Michael Larionov and Picasso. The British contemporaries were Leslie Hurry, Oliver Messel, James McKnight Kauffer, Cecil Beaton, Gwen Raverat, John Piper, Rex Whisler, Vanessa Bell, Armstrong, Burra, Meninsky, Nash and Sutherland. *The London Group* (1945), shown in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dumfries, Aberdeen, Stonehaven, Brechin and Cupar, again included several of these artists: Moore, Moynihan, Grant, Pasmore, Fitton, Rogers, Bell, Gowing, Hodgkins, Piper and Tunnard, as well as Ceri Richards, Allan Walton, David Bomberg and William Gillies.⁴⁴ Finally, the Walker Art Gallery collection (shown in Dundee in 1945 and which included sculpture and drawings) had in its historical section paintings by Gainsborough, Reynolds, Romney, Raeburn, Zoffany, Wilson and Turner and in its modern section work by Steer, Sickert, Augustus John and Piper.

The evidence, then, is that paintings, prints, drawings and some sculptures by many of the then (and many still) significant names in English, Welsh and Irish art of the period were shown at various times in Scottish galleries and less specialised venues, including schools. There was also some opportunity to see works by major historical figures. Although I have few details of printmaking exhibitions, what there is demonstrates again that a range of historical and contemporary work was shown. *Autographic Prints*, recorded in Dundee in February 1941 (seemingly the only Scottish showing) was

probably a selection from the collection of 18th, 19th and 20th century etchings, aquatints, engravings and lithographs that the BIAE had purchased in 1940.⁴⁵ *Oriental Prints* (1944) was of Japanese and Chinese wood-block prints from the collection of Glasgow Art Galleries. *Prints and Print Making* (1945) provided a non-technical introduction to the processes of etching, wood-engraving and lithography, using examples by (among others) Durer, Rembrandt, Palmer, Whistler, Maillol, Augustus John and Picasso.⁴⁶ The others, for which I have no information, appear from their titles to have been of contemporary work.

The first exhibition of predominantly Scottish work was the Kemp's exhibition in the north-east in 1940, *Contemporary Scottish and French Paintings*. Landscape paintings accounted for 34 of the 80 works, while other genres (cityscapes, still life, interiors, flower pieces, portraits, figure paintings and compositions) featured in about equal smaller numbers.⁴⁷ The speed with which the exhibition had been assembled is evidence that the project had the confidence of individual lenders and of Aberdeen Art Gallery. Many lenders were either ex-students of Edinburgh College of Art (as was Ellen Kemp) or members of its teaching staff. The BIAE had a connection to the College through its Principal, Hubert Wellington, who had been a member of Williams's Art Committee before the war. Wellington loaned a work of his own. Other artist lenders comprise a roster of prominent Scottish names, many still of interest: Penelope Beaton, James Cowie, William Gillies, Archibald McGlashan, William MacTaggart, Donald Moodie, John Maxwell, D. M. Sutherland, Colin Thoms, Charles Hemingway, Dorothy Johnstone and Ellen Kemp (under her maiden name of Willison). Aberdeen Art Gallery contributed works from its collection, and David Astor loaned two paintings by Dufy. A. F. Hyslop loaned paintings by Peploe and Hunter, and Charles Kemp a work by

Gillies. French works in the exhibition other than by Dufy were by Derain, Dufresne, Lurcat, Matisse, Renoir and Toulouse-Lautrec, and were probably mostly prints.

This sets the general pattern for subsequent Scottish exhibitions, in which permutations of the same names tend to reappear. In late 1942 an exhibition entitled *Modern Paintings* (which included eight sculptures as well as 44 oil paintings, 17 watercolours and 12 lithographs and drawings) opened in Kilmarnock.⁴⁸ Hyslop lent a Peploe and a Hunter while artist lenders included Stanley Cursiter, J. D. Fergusson, Adam Bruce Thomson, Josephine Miller, McGlashan, Gillies, Hunter, Beaton, Anne Redpath, Thoms, MacTaggart and Maxwell. Hugh Adam Crawford, Moodie and Cowie gave lithographs and drawings. The sculptures (all lent by the artists) were by Norman Forrest, Thomas Whalen and Benno Schotz.⁴⁹ Aberdeen Art Gallery was again a significant lender and landscapes were again the dominant genre, with 25 examples.⁵⁰

More evidence is provided by the two series of exhibitions organised by William MacTaggart for the BIAE under the title *Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists*. The first was circulated in late 1941 into 1942, and the second a year later. Both were sent to non-gallery venues in the west of Scotland, including the ordnance factories at Bishopton and Cardonald, the Rolls Royce factory at Hillington, the busy canteens at Yorkhill and Rothesay Docks and Glasgow Police headquarters. MacTaggart was invited by W. E. Williams to act for the BIAE independently of the Kemps early in 1941, to increase activity in Scotland. (It is notable that Williams did not simply try to secure more Scottish bookings for BIAE exhibitions but strengthened exhibition making in Scotland. This confirms that the BIAE was comfortable with devolved organisation in a way that CEMA under Keynes was not.) MacTaggart believed that a canteen

exhibition should emphasise pleasure rather than education, for the benefit of a tired workforce – an egalitarian sofa beside Matisse’s armchair for the weary businessman. To offer them Matisse and Bonnard, he said, “was like asking the hungry workers to satisfy their appetites with caviar instead of a beef steak”.⁵¹ He advised something easier to digest: Scottish landscapes, to remind the workers of holidays and the beauties of their native land:

These people who work and live in the dismal and dreary surroundings of industrial towns, need - more than any others - to be solaced by the beauty of nature rather than be puzzled by the obscure and the abstract in art.⁵²

For the first of his exhibitions he turned to his friends and colleagues Gillies, Maxwell, McGlashan, Cowie, Robert Sivell, Thomson, William Wilson, Moodie, Macintosh Patrick, Alexander Sturrock, David Foggie, Robert Allison, Henry Lintott and McLauchlan Milne. The same artists featured again in the second exhibition, joined by William and Mary Armour and Ian Fleming.

The Scottish Modern Art Association first collection, exhibited from 1944 to 1946 again included many of the names given above (Guthrie, MacTaggart, Lintott, Pirie, Sims, Duncan, Fergusson, Hunter, Cadell, Peploe, McGlashan, Thomson, Hutchison, Miller, Pryde, Foggie and McIntosh Patrick).⁵³ Others whose work was exhibited included J. Q. Pringle, W. Y. MacGregor, D. S. McColl, William Crozier and D. Y. Cameron, plus Charles Mackie and Francis Newbery who, though English, had long associations with visual art in Scotland. Landscapes were again the single most common genre. The exhibition *Drawings and Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists* (shown in Edinburgh.

Kilmarnock and Inverness in 1945) included Gillies, Foggie, MacTaggart, Redpath, Cowie, Dorothy Johnstone, Maxwell, Moodie, Miller, Sutherland, Wilson, William Geissler and Phyllis Bone as well as many more obscure figures.⁵⁴ As a final example, the *RSA 1945 Selection* (toured to Montrose, Paisley, Stranraer and Kingussie) showed Mary Armour, Beaton, Bone, Cowie, David Donaldson, Foggie, Gillies, Geissler, Hutchison, Lintott, E. S. Lumsden, McGlashan, MacTaggart, Pirie, Redpath, Schotz, Sivell, Sturrock, Sutherland, Thoms, Thomson, Robert Westwater and Whalen.

From the vantage of the present, this catalogue suggests a comfortably insular British (and Scottish) art world, for all the occasional tensions that divided the Scottish Committee from CEMA. In many respects that picture would be accurate enough, but it was compounded by the lack of opportunity to obtain works from outside Britain for most of the period covered. But the desire for international connections existed. One means created to redress the sense of isolation (and to promote friendly feeling) was *The Art of the Allies*, first produced by the Edinburgh office of the British Council in 1941. Taken on by CEMA, the exhibition was adapted and toured in 1942-43. Ten allied countries were represented and around 250 works shown, which appear to have been a mixture of loans (hence the names of James Ensor and Paul Delvaux appear) and by male and female service personnel.⁵⁵ Some of the work (to judge by a few reproductions in *The Studio*) was mediocre, but that was hardly the point of the exhibition. Its purpose was to celebrate free, individual expression: the essence (as the British Council and CEMA understood) of what was being fought for. Nevertheless, some participants, such as Oskar Kokoschka and Ivan Mestrovic, were already well known and others, including Feliks Topolski, Henrik Gottlib, Alexander Zwyy (who was to remain in Edinburgh) and Jankel Adler soon to become so.⁵⁶

Other than this, little could be done until the end of hostilities. *American Painting* (29 colour reproductions of early to contemporary work) was circulated to factories in the west of Scotland, and the Museum of Modern Art's *What is Modern Painting?* toured schools in Banffshire in 1945. In the same year Honeyman took CEMA's *French Book Illustration* for Kelvingrove. The artists represented in this were Matisse, Cocteau, Bonnard, Segonzac, Rouault, Derain, Gris, Picasso, Dufy, Toulouse-Lautrec, Camille and Lucien Pissarro, Degas, Gauguin, Forain, Fantin-Latour, Redon, Rodin, Denis, Pascin, Laurencin, Altman, Lhote, Braque, Vlaminck, Chagall, Maillol, Laurens, Marcoussis, Arp, Leger, Miro, Ernst, Dali, Tanguy, Man Ray, Bellmer, Masson and Gromaire.⁵⁷ The first post-war exhibition in Britain of major international contemporaries, *Picasso and Matisse*, brought to Britain by the British Council (toured to Glasgow by the Arts Council) was shown in the National Gallery in London and at Kelvingrove in 1946. In the same year, Aberdeen Art Gallery presented *Contemporary Swedish Painting*, demonstrating the same appetite to rebuild international connections, this time with another northern culture. Scotland, then, was quick in trying to re-connect to the continent.

If these exhibitions provide evidence of wider horizons, one exhibition in particular demonstrates the BIAE's and CEMA's joint commitment to education, *The Artist at Work*. This was the single most toured exhibition of these years, in Scotland and in the south, and was planned and organised by Ellen Kemp working in collaboration with the conservator Helmut Ruhemann. Its origin appears to have been the willingness of the public to attend lectures and talks and the interest in questions of technique, material and style. Its particular argument was that while works of art can be enjoyed for themselves, enjoyment is the greater if the technical and stylistic foundations are

understood. *The Artist at Work* existed in two forms, a large version designed for art galleries and a smaller version, on movable panels, for less specialised venues. It was one of the most successful of the wartime exhibitions, capitalising on the public interest in the craft skills, techniques and media of visual artists.⁵⁸ The large version toured major galleries in Glasgow, Dundee, Aberdeen, Paisley, Edinburgh and Perth in 1943-44 and the smaller version to at least 29 venues (including schools) across Scotland between 1945 and 1947.⁵⁹ At Kelvingrove it attracted over 42,000 visits, the largest attendance of any exhibition in Scotland before *Picasso and Matisse* in 1946.

Both versions were organised under three general headings, 'Influences', 'Personality' and 'The Work of Art'. 'Influences' was split into 'Social Environment' and 'Artistic Tradition', the former aiming to illustrate "some of the different purposes for which pictures are painted" while the latter demonstrated how artists are influenced by their predecessors. 'Personality' ("The artist's personality is the decisive factor in the creation of a work of art") was divided into 'Creative Urge' and 'Training'. The first sought to demonstrate the primordial character of artistic creativity through the work of children and "primitive men": 'Training' (the development of skills) was "important – but...alone cannot make an artist". The sub-categories of 'The Work of Art' were 'Inspiration' ("Every artist is primarily inspired by nature"), 'Planning' and 'Execution'. 'Inspiration' addressed the issues of "free choice" and working to commission, 'Planning' dealt with preliminary studies and sketches, and 'Execution' (the heart of the exhibition) with issues of individual style and technique. The various themes were illustrated in the large version (according to Williams) by "unfinished models, paintings etchings etc., and a display of tools, materials and photographs...".⁶⁰ The media covered included encaustic painting, mosaic, fresco, combined oil and

tempera, and oil painting, using reproductions of work by major artists from the 15th to the 20th centuries (finishing with Picasso, Matisse and Rouault).

Attaining Policy Aims

The evidence already presented and given below makes it clear that a foundation was laid during the war for later development. By 1950 even Hugh MacDiarmid, no admirer, conceded that the efforts of the Arts Council had helped create an unprecedented audience for the arts in Scotland.⁶¹ Reaching and developing a new public for art gave CEMA and the Arts Council political justification, but before assessing what was achieved in more detail, Cicero's question arises: who benefited? Arts professionals and artists, clearly, but who comprised the 'new' public? This can be answered only in very general terms. No data were collected during the period covered here about the social or educational characteristics, class, gender or age of exhibition visitors. The only conclusion is that the visiting public must have been diverse in age, social profile and experience of visual art. Significant numbers of schoolchildren and armed service personnel were recorded among exhibition visitors. Evacuation, war work and national service all moved and mixed people from different social strata among settled populations. There is anecdotal evidence that wartime conditions stimulated people to seek new experiences, and some unusually high attendance figures (below) suggest that exhibitions may have benefited from this climate, at least at times. It is reasonable to presume that the exhibition showings in Scottish galleries were seen, in the main, by those most inclined to visit galleries, the middle classes and better educated. However, over two thirds of showings were in venues such as halls and schools in villages and small towns, and in hostels, army bases and factories. less alienating to many than formal galleries.

Guide lecturers, often artists themselves, were central to achieving the policy aims by engaging visitors in discussion and debate. Information about them is scattered thinly through CEMA and BIAE documents and annual reports. Their numbers (especially before 1942) and the exhibitions at which they were present are obscure.⁶² Despite Keynes's suspicion of them and their rising costs, in 1942 CEMA endorsed their role, and in November 1943 CEMA engaged three of the BIAE's most experienced guide lecturers for a six month trial period.⁶³ By the end of that year Philip James was writing that, though expensive, they were "worth every penny".⁶⁴ By March 1944 growing demand led CEMA to increase their number to four.⁶⁵ The two senior guide lecturers attached to 'headquarters' were George Mayer-Marton and Marjorie Lilley.⁶⁶ The trace of guide lecturers in Scotland is faint before 1945-46. Locally recruited guide lecturers were present at the Stonehaven showing of *Contemporary Scottish and French Painting* in 1940.⁶⁷ But by 1946-47 they were active in Scotland for 33 weeks, 12 covered by lecturers from London and 21 "by temporary arrangements with artists and art teachers".⁶⁸ Through the work of the guide lecturers and being prepared to use a wide range of exhibition venues, the Scottish Committee positioned itself to address its policy aims of widening accessibility and encouraging higher standards. But how successful was it in achieving them?

Encouraging Higher Standards

To take the goal of encouraging higher standards first, a significant number of both established and younger British and Scottish artists working at the time were given opportunities to exhibit that they would otherwise have lacked. By exhibiting their work they could hope to have it written about or even occasionally illustrated, to build their reputations and to attract wider professional and public interest. By giving lectures and

demonstrations, artists could also supplement their income. Potential clients were another incentive. MacTaggart, writing of his *Scottish Scenes* exhibitions, discloses that his invited artists loaned their work hoping that the scheme would eventually produce new buyers, a motive redolent of how closely artistic production in Scotland then was bound to small-scale private patronage.⁶⁹ Trained or professional artists were therefore encouraged to make and show new work, fulfilling part of the policy remit. By exposing work to the scrutiny of fellow artists and students, higher standards could be collectively set. This ideal (of course) would be compromised to the degree that individual exhibitions fell short in quality, but the proposition remains valid in general terms.

On the other hand, by exhibiting work of good quality it was hoped to encourage wider participation and higher standards of practice among untrained or non-professional artists. But did it? Reports of local art clubs being started or gaining new members in response to exhibitions were seized on by CEMA, but no data exist that allow either a quantitative or qualitative assessment of participation. Whether meaningfully higher standards among amateurs were achieved is less important, I suggest, than the goal of raising the level of popular knowledge and understanding of visual art. To place better work in the public arena rather than worse is, after all, the most rational strategy available.

Improving Accessibility

The geographical range of the exhibitions programme was, as shown earlier, creditably wide despite some obvious limitations, and a fairly broad spectrum of exhibition types was produced. The numbers of exhibitions and showings are also impressive, and

annual figures grew steadily over the period. On this count the verdict is unambiguous: physical accessibility was clearly improved compared to pre-war norms. With its associated publications, discussions and lectures, the exhibitions programme enabled people to engage with visual art to a degree not previously possible. Both the level of public interest and the testimony of guide lecturers bear this out. In consequence, general knowledge of visual art must have been improved beyond pre-war levels. On this count, then, policy aims were achieved.

The related question of critical standards can be assessed on anecdotal evidence, principally from guide lecturers.⁷⁰ To improve popular critical judgement was the bridge that linked accessibility and standards, the former being understood not only in a spatial (geographical) sense but also in an intellectual sense. The Scottish Committee, conscious of the wider goal of popular education, on the whole avoided exhibitions thought too specialised for the task. Mary Fox recorded the conservatism of the Scottish public and curators when noting that *The Royal Academy 1943 Selection*, shown in Paisley in 1944, was thought “wildly modern; and not the fine institution it used to be in the 1880s!” However, the same exhibition had drawn “record numbers” in Dundee. She felt that touring exhibitions from the RSA, SSA and Scottish Modern Art Association were more effective in raising awareness than “the more specialised exhibitions, which James now has in preparation.” His latest, a history of mosaic, was, she believed

...pushing specialisation too far. In Scotland the curators seem to think that even Holbein has too limited an appeal to be worth having... the present trend of CEMA exhibitions is such that very few will be suitable for touring in Scotland.⁷¹

The voices of visitors are heard only occasionally in the press or quoted by guide lecturers. They are more often summarised by guide lecturers in their reports, but these are relatively consistent in the picture they give of public reactions. Honeyman, having given a lecture in Dundee in 1943, recorded that contemporary works in *English Art and the Mediterranean* drew such comments as, “We live in difficult times is it necessary to give us difficult pictures?” Another person advised that, before exhibiting an abstract work in public, the artist should “state in writing, what he intends to convey, and briefly state the meanings of the symbols used”.⁷² A desire for the familiar and comfortable in art is not particular to wartime, however, nor the wish for textual explanation. Commonly, visitors were nonplussed by modern works, which suggests complete naivete about art. Writing about *The London Group* in Cupar in 1944 a local art teacher recounted “its effect was profound, even though many suffered from a sense of bewilderment at first contact”.⁷³ ‘Bewilderment’ is commonly referred to by guide lecturers. Outright anger, when it was encountered, might well reflect some knowledge of art and an emotional commitment to an ideal of what it ought to be. Some hostility came from art-educated people, including teachers. On the other hand, public interest and even enthusiasm was strong enough to be remarked on by guide lecturers, and demand for their services (again on patchy but convincing evidence) grew steadily throughout the war. If some visitors were irreconcilable, guide lecturers often felt (without claiming to have worked wonders) that they had managed to draw out in simple terms the aesthetic qualities of artworks which fixation on subject matter made invisible.

The Scottish Committee was able to apply to CEMA to have its guide lecturers come north. In 1944, Lilley attended for a week at *British Narrative Paintings from the Tate*

Gallery in Dundee.⁷⁴ In 1945, *The London Group* had Lilley for a week at Dumfries Academy and Mayer-Marton for a week each at Stonehaven and Cupar. Lilley also covered *The Scottish Modern Art Association* first collection for a week in Arbroath, followed by Mayer-Marton.⁷⁵ Locally recruited guides included teachers nominated by local education authorities.⁷⁶ In 1945 CEMA permitted the Scottish Committee to employ a permanent guide lecturer, Patrick Thoms, who took up his post in December.⁷⁷ Demand was still increasing and a list of supplementary guide lecturers was approved which does not survive. The one known name, J. D. Fergusson, was removed from the list, being “not considered particularly suitable for this kind of work”.⁷⁸ It may have been through this process that Ann Redpath’s services were secured, for at least one exhibition, at Paisley in 1946. Other Scottish artists who acted as guide lecturers and special lecturers on occasions included William MacTaggart, James Cowie, Lennox Paterson, Josephine Miller, Graham Murray, Hugh Adam Crawford and Benno Schotz. Guide lecturers’ reports offer some of the few but most lively accounts of the conditions in which exhibitions were shown. At Dumfries Academy, *The London Group* was shown next to the kitchen, accompanied, as Lilley recounted, by:

...the clash of dishes, running taps, mysterious explosions from boilers and so forth. The schools enjoyed these diversions, but I did not find them particularly helpful.⁷⁹

The exhibition was visited by armed services and schools groups (mainly older children from outlying areas) and by local townspeople. Despite puzzlement and some hostility the exhibition forced visitors:

...drastically out of their rut. Moore was beyond most people, schools or adults, although he had a few ardent admirers; Tunnard was unexpectedly popular when visitors could be persuaded to study him; a few revelled in Hitchens, but he was on the whole a mystery. Also Gillies. I find sensibility and “flow” the most difficult qualities of all to get across. Piper received the most general appreciation.⁸⁰

A local art teacher was the fiercest critic, while the headmaster thought more familiar works would have enabled pupils to “travel from the known to the unknown”. Lilley disagreed, arguing that confronting the unknown was educationally better, and to assist this advocated sending sets of postcards of modern work free to schools. Her conclusion: “Dumfries is definitely a town with a nucleus of interested people”. Mayer-Marton wrote of it at Brechin that people had been “bewildered” at the opening. But he was almost overwhelmed by people wanting to ask questions, and wrote:

I do not want to suggest that Brechin liked or now likes the exhibition or the kind of pictures they were debating with great gusto. There was much bewilderment...but fairly general agreement that this year's show was much more vital and interesting than the last one - the Scottish Modern Art Association.... It is difficult for me to assess how much of that feeling should be ascribed to my presence as a nucleus of discussions. Frequently I had to make the effort of drawing people's attention to the pictures they were reasoning about - but you very likely know that there is a tendency of debating, perhaps not only in Scotland, to become autonomous. Anyhow, there is no cause to assume that people's faculty to see has atrophied. My attempts to appeal to it were

surprisingly successful in many cases. ... To add a line to the chapter on Scottish intellectualism: numerous people seemed to be disappointed that there were no public lectures.... It was interesting to observe that quite a few people from Arbroath, Montrose, Dundee, etc. took the trouble to travel to Brechin to see the show.⁸¹

Bewilderment in Dumfries and Brechin was matched when the same exhibition was shown in Cupar, but it was still judged a success and membership of the local art society increased.⁸² At the Thurso showing of *The Scottish Modern Art Association* (first collection) in August strong interest was recorded, the most popular work being the meticulously descriptive landscapes of Macintosh Patrick.⁸³ Another guide lecturer, Eric Westbrook, offers an interesting glimpse of this exhibition in a room attached to a British Restaurant in Girvan in 1945. The advantage of the venue, he wrote, was its reassuring familiarity, which “gave confidence to people frightened by the atmosphere of public galleries”. The most engaging works were those that appeared “true to nature” (especially landscapes) and which demonstrated skill and the commitment of time to descriptive effect. Although still life paintings seemed pointless to many, he recorded, this enabled him to discuss qualities such as form, colour and design as separate values from ‘likeness’. In sum, the exhibition (he thought) had been “too easy” in that the majority of the works tended to confirm the popular view that “art should be pretty”.⁸⁴ The verdict in Ayr from art teachers and others was that the exhibition was “disappointing”, but whether this referred to uneven quality or the level of challenge it posed is not made clear.⁸⁵

Mayer-Marton reported on the exhibition *Contemporary Scottish Painting* in Perth in 1945, in which he states that his discussions, to overcome resistance to anything unfamiliar, were conducted at a basic level. Although he didn't claim to have changed anyone's mind he believed that at least they would "not be quite so sure of their refusal of the uncomprehended as heretofore".⁸⁶ Also in 1945, a visitor to *The Wyndham Vint Collection* (which had earlier caused controversy in the press in Orkney) described her surprise at her first encounter with modern French painting, but concluded that she had come away "liking a good half dozen".⁸⁷ In 1945 a report on the impact of a small touring version of *The Artist at Work* in army bases across Britain concluded that:

...it was received with great interest and enthusiasm, sometimes among those always interested in art, but others reported that the attractive layout and detail attracted many more than usual. Some groups were paraded there and lectured to, and it was well received.

Whether this is quite the whole truth we cannot say, but the same report commented that in places where personnel had not been marshalled into the exhibition, the response had been less good.⁸⁸ At the beginning of April 1946 Ann Redpath spent a week in Paisley with *The McInnes Collection* (from Glasgow Art Galleries) recording that she had talked mainly about Impressionism and "appreciation generally" to over 450 schoolchildren and to "a steady trickle" of the public. Response must have been good however, for at times she "had only a minute between lectures" and summed up her time in Paisley as "most exhausting but stimulating".⁸⁹ When Tom Honeyman lectured on Picasso in Glasgow in 1946, he spoke to a packed lecture theatre from which "hundreds of people were turned away".⁹⁰ My final example to give some direct insight

into public engagement and reaction is Lilley's report of September 1946 on *The Scottish Modern Art Association* (second collection) at West Linton. This was visited by schoolchildren from Peebles High School, by a literary circle from Edinburgh and "by all the mothers of Midlothian" (collected personally by Ellen Kemp). Lilley rejoiced that "Scottish intellectual curiosity" still prevailed against the creeping influence of cinema.⁹¹

On this evidence, exhibitions tended not to be greeted with indifference. Sometimes they were too challenging, sometimes perhaps not challenging enough. Even the work of Royal Academicians could seem startlingly new, and abstract works were often beyond the pale. The scattered insights given by the guide lecturers confirm what would be expected: that the essence of their project was to overcome incomprehension and hostility towards unfamiliar, usually modern, work that may often have been far from radical in professional terms. There can be no doubt that, as Smith has written, the guide lecturers were attempting to demystify modern art for a popular audience. The impression given by the reports above suggests that, whatever the response to any one exhibition, public approval of the principle of having such exhibitions developed and grew during the war years. The continued growth of receiving venues in the years after the war is testimony to this.

Attendance

Another, more oblique, track on public response to exhibitions is level of attendance. Had there been little public appetite for the wartime exhibitions, over-all attendance would have been low. The available data on the contrary suggests good levels of attendance, although some caution is needed. Exhibition attendance varies, depending

on factors including the subject of the exhibition, the venue, publicity, population and even weather. Attendance was estimated by head count, which tends to inflate numbers, and CEMA, the BIAE and venues themselves had a motive to count high. Also, individuals commonly visit exhibitions more than once, as CEMA itself noted, hence the figures that follow are not to be taken as a count of individual visitors, of which no estimate is possible.

In December 1940 W. E. Williams estimated visits to Art for the People exhibitions, all in small towns, at 270,000, including 130,000 schoolchildren, but gave no total number of showings with which to correlate these numbers.⁹² About a year later, CEMA gave a figure of 300,000 visits.⁹³ In November 1941, the BIAE estimated total attendance for 1940-41 at over 340,000 for 101 showings.⁹⁴ CEMA's Annual Report for 1941-42 records that "more than half a million visitors" [sic] had been attracted to its exhibitions in two years.⁹⁵ On average, then, exhibitions seem to have been attracting about 3,400 visits per showing. If that average held good for Scotland it would suggest that the 203 identifiable main exhibition showings in Scotland over the six-year period attracted about 690,000 visits. If the estimate of 230 showings is used, the figure rises to 780,000.

How plausible is this? Some records help set general parameters. An average of 450 visits a day for *Contemporary Scottish and French Painting* (1940), was recorded during its run in Stonehaven.⁹⁶ Had this been sustained for five days a week over three weeks, a total of over 6,700 visits would have resulted. If such a large figure for a small centre been achieved, CEMA would probably have remarked on it and it seems more likely that visits were not sustained at that level. Visitors would have been drawn from Stonehaven and the immediately adjacent county, and possibly a few from Aberdeen.

Stonehaven had a population of about 4,500 and the whole county of Kincardine nearly 40,000. On this estimate of available population, to achieve 6,700 visits (even counting repeat visits) would have required something like 17% of that population to attend.⁹⁷ On the other hand, an average of 226 visits per day would have reached the notional average of 3,400 in total, drawing on about 8% of the notional available population. Although that seems more attainable, given the relative novelty of the exhibition and its being held in a school it is quite possible, on the basis of some figures below, that the true figure may have been nearer the upper than the lower estimate.

The highest actual counts in Scotland were in Glasgow, with a city population of over 1,000,000. In 1941 over 24,000 visits (about 2.4% of the city population) were recorded at *The Art of the Allies*.⁹⁸ In 1944 another large figure, 42,250 (4.2% of the population) was recorded for *The Artist at Work*.⁹⁹ *Picasso and Matisse*, in 1946, was the best attended of all, recording 89,952 visits (9.0% of the population), 10,828 on the final day of its three-week run.¹⁰⁰ With their varying levels of popular appeal, then, three exhibitions generated 156,000 visits in Glasgow alone. Not all had such pulling-power of course, and over two thirds were shown in smaller venues, towns and communities. At the lower end of the scale, the 1941 exhibition *Modern Scottish, English and French Painting* at Montrose (with a population of about 10,000) had 1,500 visits.¹⁰¹ This would have required upwards of 15% of the immediate local population of about 10,200 to attend, although visitors from the nearby county and repeat visits would reduce this figure. In 1944 *The Scottish Modern Art Association* (first collection) attracted (as CEMA obtusely put it) “over 12% of the population” of Arbroath which, assuming a population of about 18,000, I estimate at 2,000 visits. The same exhibition attracted 1,157 in Thurso (39% of a population of about 3,000) and 1,000 in Cupar (22% of the

burgh's population of about 4,500).¹⁰² *The London Group* scored 1,180 visits in Dumfries (about 5% of its population of 22,000), 1,546 in Cupar (34%) and 620 in Brechin (9% of a population of about 7,000).¹⁰³ At the lowest level, then, attendance could be in the hundreds. Another example would be *The Wyndham Vint Collection*, which attracted 400 visits in ten days in Kirkwall, about 11% of the immediate population of about 3,500 (but bearing in mind repeat visits).¹⁰⁴ Attendance in places like Strathpeffer and Girvan, and at venues like Glasgow Police headquarters and YMCA huts, were presumably of this order. Again, caution is needed. *The London Group* exhibition in Cupar was shown in Bell Baxter High School, and the 946 pupils on the school roll were counted in the visitors' total. Not the most scrupulous practice, this explains the inflated percentage of population figures from Cupar (which may have been repeated in the Thurso showing referred to above, but not obviously elsewhere).

On this slim basis, all that can be attempted is a plausible estimate of minimum attendance. To smooth out the evident variability of attendance against population, I group figures in four broad bands, 0-20,000; 20,000-50,000; 50,000-100,000; and 100,000-200,000.¹⁰⁵ I deal with Edinburgh and Glasgow separately. There were 42 centres in the first category where 68 showings were held. Assuming an average of 2,000 visits, the total would be 136,000. In the second category are 10 centres where 34 showings were held. Assuming an average of 3,000 visits produces 102,000 in total. The two centres in category three (Greenock and Paisley) held 11 showings. Assuming 4,000 visits on average produces a total of 44,000. Aberdeen and Dundee are the two centres in category four. Here, 28 showings were held and, assuming an average of 5,000 visits, the result is 140,000. In total, then, we reach a figure of 398,000 visits for 141 showings.

Edinburgh (population about 440,000) held 19 showings, 11 of which were in the National Gallery of Scotland. If those 11 averaged 6,000 visits and the remaining eight in smaller venues averaged 2,000, a total of 82,000 visits is attained. Finally, Glasgow had 24 showings, of which seven were in Kelvingrove. Assuming the 17 in smaller venues averaged 2,000 visits each and four of the remaining seven in Kelvingrove (that is, discounting the three for which definite figures are available) averaged 8,000 each, an estimate of 66,000 is reached. Adding back in the 156,000 visits to the three remaining Kelvingrove showings produces a total of 222,000. To this has to be added nine counties where 12 showings were held in unidentified centres and seven in venues that can't be geographically located. On a cautious estimate of 500 visits per showing, another 8,500 may be added. Adding 27 to reach the minimum estimate of actual showings (230) would produce another 54,000 visits and a grand total of 764,500 visits. Finally, if 10% is deducted to guard against exaggeration, the outcome is 688,000, an average of less than 3,000 visits per showing, well within CEMA's own estimates.

Two factors must be added back in. Firstly, attendance at the exhibitions in the National Gallery in Edinburgh is probably underestimated here. Secondly and more significantly, visits to exhibitions of reproductions should be counted. No attendance figures exist for these, however. Some were held in places like the Yorkhill and Rothesay Dock canteens, where many thousands would have passed through each week without having sought out (or even noticing) an exhibition. Many other exhibitions, however, were shown in places where it would be valid to count visits. This would apply to over 50 of those given in Table 23, including factories, civil defence and army centres, schools and youth clubs. Other unidentified 'legitimate' venues are probably indicated in phrases such as "smaller towns", "various centres" and "factory tour". It would not be

unrealistic, and probably very modest, to assume that 100,000 visits to exhibitions of reproductions over six years could safely be added to the total estimate. It would seem, then, that a reasonable estimate of minimum Scottish attendance would be around 880,000 visits: impressive but almost certainly not a full accounting. The reality may well have been around one million.

¹ Verses from a comic poem sent to Fox after the exhibition of *The Scottish Modern Art Association* (first collection) at Brechin (15 July 1945, NLS Sep. 355/535).

² Three examples: the local Montrose 'CEMA Committee' (1942); the Glasgow Archaeological Society (1943); and the Aberdeen-Scandinavian Society (1946).

³ Minutes of the Art Advisory Committee, 19 November 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/271.

⁴ Table 2.

⁵ Table 3. Remembering again that this may mask some exhibitions organised by associated bodies.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ As I am only dealing with exhibitions shown in Scotland, I do not include the Scottish Committee's first project, *Twenty-Six Living Scottish Artists* (1943) which was toured in England.

⁸ William MacTaggart's series, *Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists* (1941-42) were BIAE commissions. However, they were Scottish productions and are counted as such here.

⁹ Table 4.

¹⁰ Table 5.

¹¹ Table 6. England and Wales figures from Glasgow to Clark, table of exhibitions, 1946, VA EL 2/8.

¹² Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Scottish Committee, 27 March 1945, NLS Acc. 9737/250.

¹³ Table 8.

¹⁴ Table 15.

¹⁵ Jan Gordon, art critic for *The Studio*, writing about the Art for the People exhibition in London in 1939, gives an insight into a reaction the exhibitions could produce: "a sort of resentment sometimes arises between what might be called "the yearners" and "the learners," the former not realizing that if they have to seek artistic pleasure in what is designedly a classroom, they should suffer gladly the drawback of the lecturer" (*The Studio*, Vol. CXXIII, 1939).

¹⁶ The variable is the five unidentified showings in 1941-42 that I have attributed to the BIAE in Table 8.

¹⁷ Table 10.

¹⁸ Ellen Kemp, 27 October 1944 (NLS Dep. 355/538).

¹⁹ An Arts Council exhibition, *History of Photography*, was shown in Scotland in 1948.

²⁰ Table 11.

²¹ Table 12.

²² Table 14. One showing (*The McInnes Collection*) was in Montrose Art Gallery.

²³ *The Glasgow School* was organised by Glasgow Art Galleries and *Swedish Painting* by the Aberdeen-Scandinavian Society, with the approval of the Scottish Committee.

²⁴ Table 18.

²⁵ The figures used are from the 1931 Census of Scotland. No census was taken in 1941. National service and war work must have had an impact on local populations, but detailed data is not available. The figures given should be treated as approximate only.

²⁶ Table 21.

²⁷ Table 22.

²⁸ Table 23.

²⁹ Madras College, St. Andrews, Dingwall Academy, the Nicholson Institute, Selkirk Academy and Loretto School. One is alluded to as 'B High School', which may be Brechin.

³⁰ Table 25.

³¹ *CEMA Art Exhibitions* (pamphlet), 1944, NLS Acc. 9727/270.

³² Council Paper XLIII, April 1940, GD 281/51/1/43.

³³ Minutes of the Second Meeting of Council, 28 May 1940, VA EL 1/6.

³⁴ Undated Council Paper, 1940, NA ED 136/190.

³⁵ Council Paper LXXXII, 1941, NA ED 136/190.

³⁶ CEMA forthcoming Exhibitions, 1943-44, NLS Acc. 9787/270.

³⁷ Some exhibitions had around 60 images and others around 25. If 40 is taken as the average, it would suggest that there were over 8,000 reproductions.

³⁸ Table 26.

³⁹ Council Paper CXIII, November 1942, NA ED 136/190.

⁴⁰ Mavor, draft catalogue essay, 1944, NLS Dep. 355/535.

⁴¹ The catalogue was written by D.S. McColl.

⁴² Exhibition catalogue, NLS Acc. 9787/270.

⁴³ Another selection was toured in 1944-45 but not in Scotland.

⁹⁹ *The Studio*: Vol. CXXIX; No. 623, February 1945, pp. 33-45.

⁴⁵ Williams, Plan for Exhibitions, January 1940, Fifth Meeting of CEMA (GD 281/51/1).

⁴⁶ *BIAE Annual Report, 1945-46*, GU ACE 5/3/1/2.

⁴⁷ Hyslop papers, AAG. Note the incorrect name given to CEMA. It would seem that a guide lecturer was to be present, and probably special lectures held. These are nowhere else referred to.

⁴⁸ The exhibition was opened by Sir William McKechnie who shortly afterwards joined the Scottish Committee.

⁴⁹ Other UK artists were Augustus John, Wyndham Lewis, Piper, Hitchens, Eric Ravilious, Christopher Wood, Frank Dobson, Kenneth Rowntree, Paul Nash and Ambrose McEvoy. French works were by Dufy, Toulouse-Lautrec, Vuillard, Bonnard, Pierre Renoir, Leger, Mary Duras and Vlaminck.

⁵⁰ Hugh Adam Crawford did a demonstration/lecture on portraiture, Honeyman a lecture and discussion on 'An Approach to Painting' and Benno Schotz a lantern lecture on The Craft of the Sculptor. (*British Institute of Adult Education, Art for the People; Exhibition of Modern Paintings in the Dick Institute, Kilmarnock, 31 Oct.-5 December 1942*; Hyslop papers, AAG).

⁵¹ MacTaggart to Williams, Print Exhibitions in Scottish Munitions Factories, 3 April 1941, NLS Acc. 8636/15.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ This exhibition toured widely, to Brechin, Dundee, Paisley, Cupar, Perth, Eyemouth, Arbroath, Girvan, Troon, Falkirk, Wick, Thurso and West Linton.

⁵⁴ *Scottish Watercolours, CEMA Exhibition in Edinburgh; The Scotsman*, 4 April 1945, NAS ED 61/28.

⁵⁵ The ten were Norway, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Holland, Free France, Greece, Russia and China. How the works were collected is not evident, but some came from private collections, including Harold Nicholson's. When originally planned, the USA was not yet in the war and hence was not represented. By 1942 it was hoped to do a separate exhibition purely of American work but this seems not to have happened.

⁵⁶ *Allied Artists*, by A.A. Longden, *The Studio*, Vol. CXXIV, 1942.

⁵⁷ *An Exhibition of French Book Illustration, 1895-1945*, NLS HP2 96.6641.

⁵⁸ A review in *The Christian Science Monitor* gives an insight into the development of Scottish Branch exhibitions, and explains Ellen Kemp's intentions for the exhibition: "Over 70 exhibitions of paintings, part of the "Art for the People" scheme of the BIAE, have been shown in Scottish towns and villages since the project was extended to Scotland. The work began in the summer of 1940, when Mr. Charles Kemp, then honorary secretary of the Institute's Scottish Branch, assisted by his wife, selected a group of about 60 paintings, which they showed in Aberdeen, Stonehaven and Inveraray [sic]. When Mr. Kemp joined the Army his wife was left to carry on this formidable piece of pioneer work alone. As Mrs Kemp told the writer, to hold an exhibition is easier said than done. First it must be decided what the exhibition is to comprise. Next, whose advice should be sought? Where can the paintings be found, and how can they be procured for exhibition? Good speakers must be found and persuaded to travel long distances. Insurance and transport, always a problem, is a formidable one in wartime. All this Mrs Kemp had to do without clerical assistance. But she was encouraged by the increasing response and by the amount of responsibility shouldered locally, especially by directors and curators of art galleries, artists, private collectors, and art teachers in Scotland. Touring with these exhibitions gave Mrs Kemp a fine opportunity for studying the ordinary man's reaction to art, and of hearing of his preferences and difficulties. The experience made her realize that occasional exhibitions were of little value. This led her to plan and organize an exhibition - "The Artist at Work" - to provide a background and serve as a rough guide to enable the lay student to form his own judgement based on some knowledge and understanding.... A sculpture section was designed by Benno Schotz who himself gave practical demonstrations of the sculptor at work." *The Christian Science Monitor*, 29 July 1944, NLS Dep. 355/538.

-
- ⁵⁹ The exhibition was accompanied by a catalogue published by Penguin Specials. In 1951 a substantial well-illustrated book of the exhibition was also published by Penguin. Both were no doubt facilitated by W. E. Williams who was a director of Penguin Books.
- ⁶⁰ Williams, W.E. (op. cit.). The small version would have been mainly if not entirely photography-based.
- ⁶¹ MacDiarmid, *Aesthetics in Scotland*, (Ed., Bold), Edinburgh, Mainstream, 1984), p. 29. MacDiarmid's suspicions of the Arts Council are discussed in my conclusion.
- ⁶² In December (?) 1940 Williams stated that the BIAE retained eight on a 'piece work' basis (BIAE Executive Committee Minute Book, NIACE).
- ⁶³ Minutes of First Meeting of BIAE Art Sub-Committee, 9 November 1943, BIAE Art Sub-Committee Minute Book, NIACE. Salaries were £12 per week for permanent guide lecturers and £10 for casuals (Minutes of 24th Meeting of CEMA, 19 October 1943, VA EL 1/7).
- ⁶⁴ Philip James, CEMA Paper 174, 30 December 1943, NA ED 136/191.
- ⁶⁵ Minutes of 26th Meeting of CEMA, 14 March 1944, VA EL 1/7.
- ⁶⁶ George Mayer-Marton (b. 1897) was an Hungarian artist who had studied in Vienna and Munich. His work was predominantly watercolour landscape (*The Studio*, Vol. 117, 1939, p. 258).
- ⁶⁷ Williams and Clark, Progress Report, June 1940, NAS GC 281/51/1/1). One would almost certainly have been present at the earlier Aberdeen showing and possibly at Inverurie.
- ⁶⁸ Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of the Scottish Committee, 11 April 1947, VA EL 4/104.
- ⁶⁹ MacTaggart, text in NLS Acc. 8636/15.
- ⁷⁰ Guide lecturer's reports were sent direct to London and copied to the Scottish Committee, which may explain their rarity (Kemp to Mavor, 31 January 1946, NLS Acc. 11309/5).
- ⁷¹ Fox to Honeyman, 7 March 1944, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁷² Notes written by visitors kept by Honeyman in his copy of the exhibition catalogue, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁷³ George Liddle, undated report on *The London Group*, Cupar, NLS 9787/270.
- ⁷⁴ Minutes of 11th Meeting of the Scottish Committee, 15 September 1944, and Minutes of the Art Advisory Committee, 16 November 1944, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁷⁵ Minutes of the Art Advisory Committee, 27 March 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid. 19 November 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁷⁷ Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Scottish Committee, 27 March 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/270. Thoms stayed in post until 1951. See my earlier discussion in Volume One, pp. 191-192.
- ⁷⁸ Minutes of Art Advisory Committee, 19 November 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁷⁹ Marjorie Lilley, report on *The London Group* at Dumfries Academy, 17-31 March 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/270/13/1/20.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid.
- ⁸¹ Mayer-Marton, undated report on *The London Group*, Brechin, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁸² George Liddle, undated report on *The London Group*, Cupar, NLS 9787/270/13/1/44.
- ⁸³ Graham Murray, undated report, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁸⁴ Eric Westbrook, undated lecturer's report, NLS Acc. 9787/270/13/1/24.
- ⁸⁵ Murray to Kemp, 14 July 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/270. It was this exhibition that Mavor went to print to defend against "blasphemy".
- ⁸⁶ Mayer-Marton, report on *Contemporary Scottish Painting*, 27 July 1945, NLS Acc. 9787/270.
- ⁸⁷ Matthews to Kemp, 17 November 1945, NLS Dep. 355/353.
- ⁸⁸ Consolidated Report of Command Education Officers, War Office, Northern, Southern, Eastern Western, Scottish, and London Commands, 28 May 1945, NLS Dep. 355/538.
- ⁸⁹ Redpath to Kemp, 10 April 1946, NLS Acc. 11309/5.
- ⁹⁰ *The Glasgow Herald*, 11 February 1946.
- ⁹¹ Marjorie Lilley, report, 22 September 1946, NLS Acc, 11309/5.
- ⁹² Council Paper LXXXII, undated, NA ED 136/190. The figures were probably counted April 1940–March 1941.
- ⁹³ *CEMA Bulletin No. 19*, November 1941, ACE Library.
- ⁹⁴ Council Paper CXIII, November 1942, NA ED 136/190. BIAE figures were probably November 1940–October 1941.
- ⁹⁵ White, op. cit. p. 37.
- ⁹⁶ Williams and Clark, Progress Report, June 1940, NAS GD 281/51/1/1. Guide lecturers in attendance reported that people were making repeated visits.
- ⁹⁷ I again use figures from the 1931 Census of Scotland.
- ⁹⁸ *CEMA Bulletin 18* (wrongly numbered 17), October 1941, ACE Library.
- ⁹⁹ Undated report (November?) 1944, NLS Dep. 355/538.

¹⁰⁰ *The Glasgow Herald*, 11 February 1946. *Picasso and Matisse* attracted 350,000 visits at the National Gallery, London, in 1945 (*Arts Council of Great Britain, First Annual Report, 1945-46*). Glasgow continued to produce large figures. *Van Gogh* (1948) for example, drew 100,000 visits in three weeks. Average monthly attendance at Kelvingrove during the war is given as 35,000, but it is not clear if this refers to visits to special exhibitions or to the museum as a whole. It seems safer to regard it as the latter (*The Glasgow Herald*, 11 February 1946).

¹⁰¹ *Montrose Standard*, 2 August 1941, given in Blackwood, op. cit. Note 18, p. 109.

¹⁰² Cupar figure given in minutes of the Art Advisory Committee, 16 November 1944; Arbroath figure in minutes of 27 March 1945; Thurso figure in guide lecturer's report, undated (September?) 1945 (NLS Acc. 9787/270). Average attendance was 80 per day.

¹⁰³ Dumfries figures given in guide lecturer's report, NLS Acc. 9787/270/13/1/20. They included 250 at the opening, 14 schools groups (288) and 3 army groups (24-30). 55 attended a public lecture. Average daily attendance 40-45. Brechin figure given in guide lecturer's report, undated (September?) 1945, NLS Acc. 9727/270. Cupar figure given in art teacher's report, undated (September?) 1945, NLS Acc. 9727/270.

¹⁰⁴ Figure given in the minutes of the Art Advisory Committee, 16 November 1944, NLS Acc. 9787/270.

¹⁰⁵ Table 15.

Part Six

Conclusion

Chapter 16: CEMA and the Arts Council in Scotland

I have devoted many years to seek to overcome the inability of the academic authorities and literary circles in many countries to recognise that Scotland is a separate and very different country from England, that Scotland has an independent literary tradition at odds in many vital respects with the English tradition - and that it has always been, and remains, the aim of the latter to eliminate the former and assimilate Scottish Standards completely to English. Government agencies like the Arts Council, the British Council, government Consulates, etc. have pursued this policy...

Hugh MacDiarmid¹

If MacDiarmid was right the evidence suggests that CEMA, the Arts Council and the Scottish Committee pursued this policy in a peculiarly self-defeating way. But the question has to be addressed: were they in any way agents of cultural domination or assimilation? Smith has argued that CEMA was the instrument of a dominant (London metropolitan) culture, with an ideological commitment to “a unified national culture”. Scottish art is positioned as ‘other’ to a southern norm.² By implication, Scottish art was assigned a minor place and an inferior status in CEMA’s scheme of things. Beveridge and Turnbull’s use of Fanon’s concept of inferiorisation in respect of Scottish culture hovers in the background.³ Smith’s interpretation implies that CEMA and the Arts Council were instruments of cultural colonisation, an English intrusion into Scotland in more than an organisational sense. There are enough pieces of evidence, superficially, to give these claims some plausibility, but I argue that they are at various points wrong, over-simplified and exaggerated, concealing important subtleties that closer attention

draws out. There were threats to the identity of Scottish art and culture in the wider sense but they arose from sources other than an assimilatory arts policy.

CEMA's Scottish Affinities

Before addressing those issues, I begin with why CEMA was not fundamentally at odds with Scottish social thought, which contributed to both its and the Arts Council's constitution and general policy. At this foundational level there were no principled grounds on which to reject the CEMA initiative or the enterprise it pursued. Consensus between the SED and the Board of Education was uncomplicated in this respect. CEMA was founded as a cultural welfare body with the twin aims of making the arts more widely accessible and encouraging high standards of production. The wider distribution of social goods is the essence of welfare. It was not sloppy thinking that connected high standards to wider access. However testing they might be to reconcile within finite budgets, without the former the latter would be a fraud; without the latter the former would be an elite reserve. The ethic of wider (democratic) participation in artistic goods is the mark of CEMA's inheritance, via *The 1919 Report*, adult education and social voluntarism, from Idealist social theory on which welfare in Britain is substantially founded. This was allied with the belief that aesthetic education was essential to individual development (including moral development) inherited from Ruskin, Morris, Geddes and the Arts and Crafts movement. Modern art indeed had been increasingly identified as a socially progressive force from the mid-19th century. From a political perspective, aesthetic education contributed to the production of competent citizens for a modern but still insecure democracy.

To secure a stable society by winning popular consent for political programmes increasingly depended on the wider diffusion of material and abstract goods. The objective was to overcome class divisions by the amelioration of inequalities while preserving the essential liberties of the individual. Consensus involved negotiated compromise between opposing political interests and between the political and civil spheres. CEMA was a classic compromise body, founded on liberal principles that, within limits, embraced various opinions held by art-form specialists and 'lay' generalist members who were expected to find common ground for action through discussion. Sir Kenneth Clark, for example, felt that CEMA under Jones over-emphasised its social mission and preferred Keynes's bias towards artistic objectives. Ralph Vaughan Williams on the other hand consistently advocated a policy of popularisation.⁴ Excluded were conservatives who could not stomach state intervention (for example, elements in the Royal Academy) and those on the far left (such as Herbert Read, who published *To Hell with Culture* in 1941) for whom such bodies were tainted by bourgeois compromise. This was the basis of what Raymond Williams called the Council's policy of "administered consensus by co-option".⁵ The Scottish Committee replicated this same consensus. Pearson regards the inclusion of non-specialists as reflecting a culture of elite amateurism. Valid as this criticism is, the underlying principle that the general knowledge and insight of non-specialists should temper expert opinion is valuable. The non-specialist (it can be argued) is better placed to reflect public interests and act as a barrier against a professional 'closed shop'. It should be evident already why CEMA and the Arts Council were not equipped to see through a programme as explosive as the assimilation of Scottish culture.

That CEMA developed (largely) out of adult education endowed it with characteristics that reflected the convictions of its prime movers, Tom Jones and W. E. Williams. Though Keynes had other priorities, until 1945 he too believed that the Arts Council should reside under the Ministry of Education, changing his opinion (it seems) for purely strategic reasons. Keynes never disavowed the educational function of the Arts Council, though he conceived it differently from Jones. Although the creation of rounded citizens was a goal to which CEMA and the Arts Council might contribute, art was not valued only in instrumental terms, but for itself. The purpose (for example) of guide lecturers was not to condition the views of those with whom they interacted but to equip them with concepts and standards for the exercise of their own critical capacities. Both Jones and Williams assigned a high place in human activity to the arts and both had worked to secure them a stronger place in adult education, in the voluntary sector and in workers' clubs and institutes. Keynes (as Skidelsky puts it) had a "worshipful" attitude to art and, believing that society stood on the verge of an historical breakthrough (the effective solution of 'the economic problem') expected the arts to assume the central place in human life. However romantic, this was not a vision that would lead its holder to wilfully restrict access to them. Keynes was confident that an economy managed on his principles would, of its own accord, achieve the desired diffusion without compromising standards, and ultimately without government intervention. Between Jones and Keynes, it was the latter who was the more utopian.

The association with both welfare and education made CEMA and the Arts Council congruent with important strands of Scottish social thought and educational tradition. Liberal welfare policy was deeply shaped by the generation of (among others) Ruskin, Green, Caird and Smart (as I discuss in Appendix Five) all of whom were deeply

influenced by Carlyle's horror of social injustice. They shared with Carlyle a belief that material reform alone was insufficient without a corresponding moral revival, rooted in awakening man's innate sense of justice. This theme Carlyle acquired from his native Calvinism and from the philosophy of Thomas Reid. Moral awakening was not necessary only for those fitted by circumstance to act for the public good but for workers too, to realise their own creative powers. Education, then, was central to the social and moral vision of these men. The importance of education in overcoming the destructive consequences of industrialisation on the minds and spiritual wellbeing of workers can be traced from Adam Smith through Carlyle to Ruskin and from him into the Arts and Crafts movement and the wider labour movement.⁶ If CEMA was (as Sinclair claims) "a product of Welsh inspiration and English administration" a Scottish contribution can be found in its intellectual origins. CEMA's moderate, consensual credentials and its progressive educational and social objectives were entirely compatible with the dominant Scottish political culture.

CEMA and the Politics of Identity

War was the catalyst for the creation of CEMA. The acceptance by the government that voluntary organisations carrying out valuable 'national' work should receive state support created the opportunity that Williams and Jones were able to exploit. The informal fringe of adult education was drawn into the sphere of policymaking. Poggi helps explain why the change came in a moment of crisis. Discussing the harsh political theory of Carl Schmitt (1889-1985) for whom the over-riding purpose of the state is to know its enemies and to protect its interests, he writes:

Politics is...concerned with setting and maintaining the boundaries between collectivities, and in particular with protecting the collectivity's cultural identity from outside threats."⁷

Schmitt conceived the world to be composed of mutually suspicious states eternally poised for defensive-aggressive action. Each derives its integrity from the forms of life that define its collectivity. As these are the products of fundamental human capacities, they are inherently divergent and can only be realised when the state is powerful enough to protect them from disruption by external enemies, that is, by other collectivities pursuing interests of their own. The heart of Schmitt's political philosophy is his claim that, in the last resort, political action is not rational and legalistic. As Poggi puts it, each political act is:

...inherently a decision about an emergency, an unstable and consequence-laden situation in which rapidly apprehended necessity and expediency dictate action.... The ultimate political decision is existential, not normative: it is a response to a condition imposed on Us by the Other.⁸

This describes the situation that faced the founders of CEMA in 1939-40. A progress report of January 1940 proposed that the conditions of war emphasised that "our English [sic] cultural activities are a part of our national tradition and may therefore be regarded in one sense as more important than ever before".⁹ Faced with an external threat to the continued existence of the British collectivity, the state took the step it had hitherto declined. This was a paradigmatically existential decision, rooted in the urge to protect the forms of life that differentiated Britain from its enemies. That CEMA,

officially at least, was established as a temporary body to be disbanded when the emergency was over underscores the existential imperative. But in acting, the state implicitly raised a question that was bound to take explicit form at some point: what constituted the collectivity that was being defended? The short answer is the distinctive civil societies and cultures of Britain. CEMA's founders did not foresee this or its implications. To adapt Hewison, culture was not simply the expression of national identity: it was that identity. In practice, the new salience of cultural values applied less to Britain as an abstract whole as to its parts. In April 1940, the politics of Scottish identity began their play within CEMA.

When CEMA appeared a profound question already hovered over Scottish artists and politicians alike: did Scotland have any future as a distinctive historical and cultural entity? War and invasion were not the only agents to threaten a national collapse: they were preceded by two decades of social stress and economic attrition. Scotland was felt to be on the edge of a precipice: Devine refers to a mood in the 1930s of "introspective pessimism".¹⁰ At the same time the modern mass media were developing rapidly. Ownership of radios was increasing, cinema going reached its apogee and the advent of television could be foreseen.¹¹ The resources to transmit cultural products for popular consumption increasingly lay outside Scottish control in London or in the USA. This threatened the submersion of Scottish identity in an Anglicised or internationalised penumbra.

The feeling of powerlessness in the face of change could be articulated as self-loathing. Was it not the Scots themselves who were at fault, as it was they who were neglecting their own cultural survival? Edwin Muir's *Scottish Journey* (1935) is symptomatic.¹²

Muir believed that whereas the elite in England feared the effects of mass culture, Scotland was facing the loss of its very identity. Although the distinctive (if narrow) ways of life of the past were not entirely to be mourned, the majority of Scots had been “anglicised and Americanised, whether by film, the Press, the radio, the lending library, the public school”. His anathema is revealing:

The effect of all such innovations as the movies and the wireless is to make the place people stay in of less and less importance. Immediate environment has no longer, therefore, the shaping effect that it used to have; the inhabitants of all our towns...are being subjected more and more exclusively to action from a distance, and, which is more important, to the same action from the same distance.¹³

The reality of one's own environment is made flimsy, given a uniform texture like a film, while the determinants of cultural identity lie elsewhere. Subject to this external regime true Scottishness now resided in the past. Ultimately Muir's vision is pessimistic, crediting people with little creative grasp of their world, waiting passively to be absorbed by a spreading, homogenised internationalism. He failed to appreciate how persistent, resistant and complex the attachment to historical, national and local identities can be, albeit forged and re-forged as circumstances change. By taking his own memory (or idea) of the character of Scottish life as a datum, Muir underestimated the countervailing power of embedded identity to absorb new influences, though in a process now faster and more intense than in the past. His pessimism had already drawn the opprobrium of MacDiarmid who believed that the material to revive Scottish culture lay at hand: what was required was the will to ‘make it new’. Muir, however, hinted at the same when he urged the need for a more conscious cultural nationalism, writing of

the Scots “they are ceasing to be Scottish for lack of encouragement”.¹⁴ Sixteen years previously *The 1919 Report* had offered a presentiment of what Muir and others had come to feel, warning of the dangers of domination by a remote London culture, indifferent to the rooted vitality of regional and national differences. Its solution was education. Through individual action at local level including participation in the arts the loss of cultural vitality might be averted.

Efforts at encouragement, in reality, were all around Muir. The proliferation of national cultural and educational bodies with devolved or wholly independent Scottish constitutions is testimony to the desire for cultural revival. The SCDA (an offshoot from the British Drama League), the Scottish Branch of PEN, the Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland and the Scottish Branch of the BIAE all appeared in the 1920s. By the mid-30s they had been joined by the National Trust for Scotland, the Scottish Film Council and the Saltire Society. These autonomous and semi-autonomous cultural bodies were matched in the political, social and economic spheres. The National Party of Scotland, formed in 1928, and the Scottish Self-Government Party, formed in 1932, merged in 1934 to create the Scottish National Party. The NCSS set up the Scottish Committee on Community Service and later its Scottish Advisory Committee. Economic bodies that appeared in the 1930s included the Scottish National Development Council, the Scottish Economic Committee, the Scottish Council (Development and Industry) and the Scottish Committee of the Council for Art and Industry.

According to Harvie, “few of the numerous economic, amenity and social service organisations which were set up in the 1930s...lacked contact with the nationalist

consensus”.¹⁵ This consensus was expressed in journals such as MacDiarmid’s *Scottish Chapbook* (1922-23), William Power’s *The Scots Observer* (1926-34) and *The Scots Independent* (1926) which, financed by Roland Muirhead, evolved into the SNP’s newspaper. J. H. Whyte’s *Modern Scot* (1930-36) merged with *The Scottish Standard* to become *Outlook*, which ceased publication in late 1937.¹⁶ All reflected the pervasive concern with the issue of Scottish identity. And as Normand has shown, visual art was integral to the Scottish Renaissance, if relatively minor and later neglected in studies of the movement. The establishment of Scottish economic bodies culminated, after the report of the Gilmour Committee, in the transfer of the Scottish Office to Edinburgh in 1938-39. Though intended as a minimal administrative response to the nationalist movement, the new Scottish Office inevitably served as a focus and a symbol of what might yet be, breeding frustration such as Mavor’s when he complained of “the Gilmour glorification of the civil service”.¹⁷

CEMA emerged, then, into a Scotland in which (in Gramsci’s terms) political, economic and cultural fronts were already acting to revive the biggest consensual construct of all, national identity. Nationalism, whether cultural or political in expression, was inescapable when CEMA began to assert itself in Scotland in 1942. The politico-cultural motives behind Cursiter and Honeyman’s attempt to take over CEMA in Scotland intersected with the ‘official’ nationalism of the Scottish Office, intent on gaining leverage within an organisation that was not accountable to Scottish ministers.

CEMA and the Politics of Education

If there were wider political motives for asserting Scottish interests within CEMA, there were also departmental ones. When appointed President of the Board in late 1938 de la

Warr had been immediately confronted by planning for wartime and was prepared to reconsider the established boundaries of state education.¹⁸ He saw in CEMA the potential for longer-term departmental advantage as a permanent addition to the Board's responsibilities for adult education. Poggi offers an insight into his motives, making the point that whatever the intention behind the division of government into departments, they:

...became fairly quickly the seats of invidious interests all struggling to increase their autonomy, their reciprocal standing, and their command over resources. And this struggle placed a premium on a unit's being able to define a new societal interest as the legitimate target of its activity...¹⁹

De la Warr was certainly laying claim to a new societal interest, but less obvious are the departmental motives of the SED. It is striking that in the middle of an extremely testing time, with minimal wartime staff and a myriad of problems associated with evacuation, Mackay Thomson took a positive interest in CEMA.²⁰ I have, however, no evidence of his personal views. His correspondence with Parker and others contains no hint that CEMA was unwelcome, and his willingness to commit senior staff time to it in 1940 and after is surely proof that he valued it (as did Parker, who found its informality "exhilarating"). Because, so far as I can tell, the SED did not know of the Board's covert hopes for CEMA's longevity in April 1940, departmental ambition was not (then) a factor. Perhaps Mackay Thomson initially regarded CEMA pragmatically as a palliative for the disruption caused by evacuation. He was deeply conservative and not enthusiastic about major educational reform, but as CEMA's survival began to appear more likely, he too probably saw in it an extension of his department's reach, matching

the Board's in the south. Being separately financed, CEMA would not have been a drain on the SED's funding and this may have helped him look on it favourably. Finally, as a classicist who had served on the SED's Adult Education Committee, he may also have valued its ambition to spread 'high art' among the wider population.

The SED, however, had a particular problem with CEMA that must have had a bearing on Mackay Thomson's attitude. Issuing as it did from the Board, CEMA was structurally an English organisation not formally accountable to the SED or the Scottish Secretary, although operating in Scotland. Mackay Thomson noted this awkward fact when the Royal Charter was under discussion. Territorial sensitivities, then, were involved and the SED was vigilant in protecting its rights as far as it could. Despite this, it had been the SED in 1940 that had preferred CEMA to be funded on the Board's parliamentary vote when it could have insisted on a separate Scottish grant. But at the time CEMA was believed to be an emergency body and Cunningham's argument for an undivided pool of money appeared strong. The anomaly was tolerable because temporary. The use of the Goschen formula as an informal backstop was intended to assert the Scottish position sufficiently for the moment. Representation then became the main issue, first on the Council and then through the Scottish Committee, which was wrung from a reluctant CEMA by the Scottish Office with the weight of Tom Johnston behind it. Although the question of territorial representation was fudged, in practice the Scots and later the Welsh achieved precisely that. It would seem likely that the formation of the Scottish Committee at the end of 1942 when CEMA's prospects of achieving permanence were improving was not coincidental. Keynes's appointment as Chairman early that year implied nothing less, and by the summer Butler had made his hopes public. This coincided with the trouble with Cursiter, and so the interests of the

Scottish visual art establishment met those of the SED and Scottish Office. If CEMA became permanent and remained (as expected) under Education, there had to be better recognition of Scotland's place within it. This (I suggest) explains why Tom Johnston made his presence felt in the negotiations around the Scottish Committee, and his injunction to Mavor to be his man on the Council.

That the Scottish Office did not pursue a separate Scottish Arts Council may be explained firstly by CEMA's being an intermediate body. Government formally kept at a remove to avoid the taint of advancing state-approved culture. Whether or not Scotland should pursue its own system was, in the first instance a matter for CEMA and the Scottish Committee. Whether political support would be forthcoming for such a move was secondary (though of course decisive). Mavor's belief that more time was needed under the British wing before the arts in Scotland would be robust enough to go it alone was the dominant opinion on the Scottish Committee. Although pushed close to it, the Committee never chose independence, confident it would come soon enough. Secondly, the Scottish Office managed Scottish administrative affairs within the Union settlement. It was less likely to sponsor separation (at whatever level) than to seek solutions within a British framework. The tendency would be to look for the middle ground between incorporation and separation, managing Scottishness (so to speak) within the larger construct of Britishness.

When the Treasury assumed responsibility for CEMA in 1945 the Scottish Office did not object. It was clear by then that the Arts Council would not be the educational body imagined in 1939. No departmental issues of authority or prestige, then, were involved for the SED. If, from the London perspective, placing the new body under the Treasury

helped secure it against a Scottish breakaway (which the Scottish Office was not advocating) for the Scottish Office it resolved the territorial anomaly that had allowed an adjunct of the Board to function for five years in Scotland. It is interesting that the decision was confirmed in May 1945, after the SNP had won the Motherwell bye-election. Support was rising for both the SNP and Scottish Convention. Did this help persuade Keynes and others involved in the Charter discussions that change now was desirable? When Butler sounded him out only a week before the SNP's victory Keynes had unequivocally preferred to stay with Education.²¹ Faced with the possibility of Home Rule Keynes presumably now acquiesced to a prudent blocking move, though Butler (perhaps tactically) suggested in his last ditch effort to keep some control of the new body that Keynes would be content under either ministry.²² The link with Education, however, was continued by the Charter, under which Council appointments would be made after consultation between the Chancellor, Minister of Education and Scottish Secretary. The education departments would also nominate assessors to attend Council and Executive meetings.²³

Like CEMA itself, the Scottish Committee had no legal standing separately from the Board. Through sustained pressure at the political level Scottish interests were finally secured and given a legal footing in the Charter of 1946. But had the negotiations over Scotland's place in the Charter broken down in 1945 (as they threatened to do) and had the Scottish Committee finally decided that separation was the only option, the evidence suggests that it would have found political support from Johnston or Westwood. At no time had the SED ruled out a separate Scottish system. In 1940 it had briefly considered that possibility. Later its position was 'not now', not 'never'. As events proved, the Scottish Committee never did achieve independence. Even the Scottish Arts Council

between 1967 and 1994 remained technically a committee of the Arts Council. There are ironies here. It was the determination of the Scottish Committee backed by the Scottish Office to secure recognition for Scotland under the Charter that delivered an Arts Council of Great Britain. Had Keynes overplayed his hand, motivated by his deep objections to dividing the Council's powers, the outcome would have been fragmentation, an Arts Council for Scotland and another for England and Wales: precisely what he wanted to avoid. But in 1945-46 the Scottish Committee believed devolution was an interlude with full autonomy to follow under Home Rule. A 'shadow' Arts Council was even envisaged, to prepare for the moment. When the Home Rule wave receded, these ideas went with it. What was left was a devolved settlement robust enough to survive the next 20 years with no significant amendment and almost 50 before separation was finally imposed. Some of the protagonists of the time (Honeyman for example) might well have felt in retrospect that they had shot themselves in the foot.

Osborne Mavor as Chairman

Any assessment of the Scottish Committee involves an assessment of Mavor's achievement as Chairman. He had not been the first choice of the Scottish Office in 1940 or 1942. It was probably fortunate that he was appointed. Had the emollient Earl of Selkirk become Chairman, for example, he would hardly have been as effective as Mavor pitted against Keynes. Keynes was formidable not only on account of his intelligence but because he was "ruthless and sometimes unscrupulous" in argument.²⁴ Though he admired Keynes, Mavor needed courage to articulate and sustain opinions that he knew Keynes found objectionable. On the other hand, he seems to have been rather quick to offer his resignation when faced with difficulties. That he stepped down

in 1946 over Sir Earnest Pooley's appointment is perhaps understandable, given Pooley's previous work for the Customs and Excise panel that adjudicated on Entertainments Tax, of which Mavor had painful experience. But on three other occasions, once in 1944 and twice in 1945, he had threatened to go. During the Charter negotiations, one such instance was attached to the threat that the Scottish Committee as a whole would resign if it did not secure devolved status under the Charter. In context this was justifiable, but the two remaining occasions were over essentially trivial annoyances. His 1944 offer of resignation arose from the priority over a Scottish booking given to exhibiting *The Glasgow Boys* in Cambridge. The other, in 1945, came at a Council meeting, when a retrospective funding application from Perth Repertory Theatre was admitted, which incensed Mavor. On this occasion, Keynes dryly remarked to Glasgow that if he did resign, "we, I think, would feel resigned".²⁵ Mavor's mercurial personality clearly did not endear him to Keynes at such moments.

Although (with typical irony) Mavor called the Committee the Council's "vicereagents" in Scotland, neither he nor his colleagues held the inferiorised views that this, taken at face value, would imply. Had the Scottish Committee lacked a leader of Mavor's calibre, it could not have achieved the degree of autonomy that it did when it did. Mavor arrived with the confidence of knowing he had Tom Johnston behind him. His plan for the Three Arts Council shows how ambitious he was. It was intended to be a strong, effectively autonomous Scottish arts agency, broadly consultative and representative, accommodating regional and other interests, interacting with other Scottish cultural, economic and political bodies.²⁶ Mavor's commitment to Scottish culture is unmistakable and his later approach should be understood as taking off from this point. Once he had accepted that he was bound by CEMA's existing structure,

Parker quickly persuaded him that the best approach was evolutionary. If Mavor's Chairmanship was shaped by anyone other than Keynes it was Parker. To equip the Scottish Committee for the possibility of future autonomy, Parker proposed that its remit be "to advise and assist", implying an executive and not merely advisory role.²⁷ This phrase was pivotal to the history of CEMA and the Arts Council in Scotland. Its meaning necessarily left unresolved in 1943 and much disputed in 1945-46, Parker's subtle formulation by 1947 had delivered what it made possible: the Scottish Committee was given sole authority to act for the Council in Scotland. But chance played a part. Had Keynes not died in 1946 and had he become the Council's Chairman for the next five years, devolution would have been indefinitely postponed. His intention (as his correspondence reveals) had been to continue to deny the Scots any meaningful powers despite the Charter's apparent promise. Conflict would have ground on, and for some time at least the Scottish Committee would have been trapped by Keynes's interpretation of its terms.

Between 1943 and 1945 Mavor probed the boundaries of CEMA's capacity and tolerance, looking for opportunities to develop and consolidate the Scottish Committee's powers. In debate with Honeyman in 1945 he appears the more inclined to accept a devolved arrangement rather than aim for independence. In fact, he was simply prepared to accept 'London rule' for what he thought would be a fairly brief time longer, to begin a basic programme of institution building; a position similar to Johnston's if smaller in scope. He and Honeyman both believed Scotland would have its own Arts Council. The real difference between them was whether separation was the prerequisite for development as Honeyman thought or whether development should precede separation. Mavor believed that an independent Scottish body would be starved

of cash on its Goshen formula 'dole', presumably worrying that new buildings cost as much in Scotland as in the south (not 11/91sts), orchestras and theatre companies similarly, while opportunities for revenue-generation were smaller. Reconstruction would further restrict what was available. Mavor's position, then, was both prudent and conditioned by the Home Rule horizon that appeared so close. That his ambition remained, however, is demonstrated by his attempt in 1946 to have Honeyman appointed Director for Scotland, a sign they were not far apart in view.

Mavor and Honeyman left the best records of the Scottish Committee members, but it is apparent that their attitude to Scottish art was shared by their colleagues, whatever their individual politics might have been. Mavor, however, is especially interesting given his relationship with the London stage and his sense of London's cultural importance. He described Scotland as a "civilization within a civilization" and London as "the cultural capital of the world", but there is no sense from his correspondence that he regarded Scottish art as inferior to English or any other national tradition. Scottish art was less extensive with inevitably fewer high points than English art, but was intrinsically of equal worth. Nor did he think (any more than MacDiarmid) that Scottish art would be improved by the adoption of 'English standards'. In CEMA's own literature he condemned any such policy. Had Mavor not believed in the independent worth of Scottish culture he would have doubted the goals of Home Rule and autonomy for the Scottish Committee, and would hardly have entered his sustained contest with Keynes.

Hegemony or Assimilation?

The structures of Scottish governance and departmental politics acted against the possibility of an assimilatory cultural policy and Mavor's leadership presented another

barrier. But what is the evidence that CEMA or the Arts Council wished to pursue such a policy or somehow inadvertently tended towards it in practice? There are two aspects to this. The first takes the argument for assimilation directly: was Scottish art and culture in danger of being absorbed into a 'southern' norm (as MacDiarmid feared) either by policy or by some other means? Secondly, did they pursue a policy of what is now called 'the democratisation of culture', which proposes that 'elite culture' is in some way imposed on the 'grassroots' expression of (essentially) the working class? The alternative, 'cultural democracy' implies the encouragement of a pluralistic culture that recognises the validity and equal worth of various cultures. The implication is that elitist values displaced and diminished alternative cultural voices. I take the second of these aspects first.

The withdrawal of the Carnegie UK Trust in 1940 pushed CEMA towards the professional sector, and under Keynes this trend continued. Had the Arts Council remained under Education it is possible that the shift may not have been as thorough as it was, but in practice it largely (though never wholly) excluded the amateur side. Effectively, the Arts Council institutionalised the interests of the professional arts. Using Gramsci, Hewison sees this as exposing its hegemonic character.²⁸ The Arts Council's effect (whatever its ostensible policy) was to spread the values of 'high art' in the wider culture not as an end in itself but a means of securing a value hierarchy. In consequence, the Arts Council that Keynes created, Hewison argues, became a conservative force, acting for an anachronistic, stratified ideal increasingly redundant in a pluralist society characterised by a non-hierarchical "broad front of culture".²⁹ This position is close to Pearson's, for whom the Arts Council's commitment to 'standards'

implies the (futile) attempt to inculcate the public with a construct produced by a high and specialised level of education, and a closure of public debate.³⁰

These arguments deserve attention. CEMA, the Arts Council and the Scottish Committee all appointed their members from the artistic, social and administrative elites. Their members did not share a unanimous outlook on cultural activities, but any disagreement that existed was within acceptable limits requiring no political intervention. Despite the differences of emphasis between ‘purists’ and ‘popularisers’ there was consensus about the moral, educational and aesthetic value of the arts that were to be encouraged. ‘Art’ as such hardly needed debate, nor did the objective of bringing ‘the best to the most’. CEMA’s educational ambitions, and art’s contribution to creating the modern citizen, were means of induction into the socio-political processes of compromise and consensus that take place in civil society.³¹ Although the concept of hegemony has an authoritarian ring, it does not imply the simple imposition of a dominant ideology. Gramsci makes this clear through the various contexts in which he uses the term. It implies a continuous dynamic of negotiation and compromise oscillating around a relatively stable core of dominant values. It is not, therefore, necessarily authoritarian. Winning consent may progressively change even core values. If nothing is fixed, change is inevitable. Any democratic, pluralist society requires such processes, but the culture of the Arts Council was relatively narrow and of limited accountability. However, if it embodied the values of those deemed suitable for membership, did that secure a hegemonic position for ‘high art’?

The historical association of the arts with the best-educated and economically advantaged sections of society needs no discussion, but to dismiss them as therefore

‘irrelevant’ to others is ill conceived. Burger has argued that the modern concept of fine art becomes possible only when art can be conceived of separately from utility, as achieved by Kant in his argument for the autonomy, universality and disinterestedness of aesthetic judgement.³² Art had not previously possessed the status that Romantic thinkers and artists could now ascribe to it. In effect art is translated out of everyday reality, transfiguring the mundane business of living. Burger links this mode of thinking to the middle class’s concept of its motives as universally valid and morally good, much as Perkin describes professionals as regarding their services as “neutral and beneficent”.³³ However, as conceived by Romanticism art was secularised religion, an emanation of numenal reality. This belief was dominant throughout the 19th century and accessible to anyone through reading (for example, Ruskin, who was influential on the early labour movement). The purported universality of aesthetic values had an appeal to all classes, which historically have shared the need to believe in transcendent realities. This powerful concept was not contained within the educated elite but spilled out into society at large, and influenced progressive thinking into the second half of the 20th century, even in secular terms. It is easy to see how, for Idealist-influenced social reformers, art could possess a universal, integrative social value, possibly even as the keystone of the welfare arch (if that was not reserved for morality).

The question, then, is what were the consequences for society and for the arts of projecting ‘high art’ so conceived more widely into society? Jonathan Rose has demonstrated the weakness of the hegemonic argument in respect of working class culture and education. Using the evidence of participants he shows, for example, how working class self-education from the eighteenth century onwards was often founded on the classical canons of English and Scottish literature, which did not undermine their

class identity or campaigns for political reform.³⁴ He also discusses many examples of politically radical workers involved in adult education, including WEA classes, who rebutted contemporary accusations of ideological indoctrination.³⁵ The assumption that ideas or values are naively adopted patronises the supposed recipients and treats works of art only as ideological message-bearers, lacking the power that Matthew Arnold commended, to challenge dogmatic systems of thought.³⁶ The hegemonic argument also slides too readily along the ‘high art-elite culture’ tram-rail, separating it too firmly from middle- and working class experience. Not only was Romantic thinking widely influential, music, literature and art had been increasing in accessibility to all classes during the previous century, and the advent of radio and the recording industry had created large new audiences, especially for drama and music, including classical music.³⁷ While many still had little opportunity to experience live orchestral music or see exhibitions of new work, it is wrong to suggest that ‘high art’ had no resonance or relevance beyond an elite enclave.

Contrary to Pearson, I would argue that the concept of ‘the best’ in art does not close down debate, or seek to do so. Debate is essential because, before they are anything else, artistic standards are critical standards. All works of art are necessarily critical achievements as well as creative. What ‘the best’ might be is inherently a matter for argument. CEMA was afraid of the consequences of public passivity and of art that carried the imprimatur of the state. Its concern with standards meant encouraging critical culture. Guide lecturers sought to equip visitors with concepts to help them individually evaluate works of art. This was a discursive process (building on two decades and more of such informal work). Although most if not all of CEMA’s and the Arts Council’s members probably subscribed to the ideal of absolute aesthetic

standards, derived from Kant, in practice their policy of widening access and education undermined that very ideal. 'Standards' cannot be handed down by fiat, as unquestionable givens.

Through the Council's work, the practice and values of the arts were exposed to wider participation, criticism and challenge, opened to change by the energies and ideas of new practitioners. The cultural history of the 1950s and 1960s is of precisely such a challenge, often from working class youth, to the traditionally small artistic establishment, which permanently transformed art and popular culture (and their interplay) in Britain. As Rose has shown, there never was a passive public awaiting the stamp of elite or state culture even when society was at its most stratified and education least widespread. CEMA, the BIAE, the Arts Council and the Scottish Committee played a part in opening up to new energies what had previously been a much narrower artistic reserve. They helped reduce social stratification in the cultural field by making 'high art', more than ever, common property. In doing so, the universal aesthetic values their members no doubt cherished became less tenable. Their liberal policies played a part, inadvertently or not, in preparing the ground for contemporary cultural value pluralism.³⁸ Ironically, then, Idealism helped, through its development in social theory and application in adult education, to put in question the absolute aesthetic standards it tended towards philosophically.

Turning to the question of the assimilation of culture, the Scottish visual art establishment and the Scottish Office ensured that CEMA and the Arts Council had to accommodate Scottish interests, overcoming considerable resistance in the process. It was a struggle at first to gain adequate representation on the Council and even more

difficult to secure a Scottish Committee with meaningful powers. It is tempting, then, to assume that behind the resistance lay the undeclared purpose of MacDiarmid's fears, the assimilation of Scottish culture to 'English' (or metropolitan) standards. Smith also has described the failure of the Board to inform the SED about CEMA as "crucial to understanding the ideological implications underlying CEMA's aims".³⁹ She argues that these were centred on the formation of a national 'British' culture under the pressure of war. I believe that this is wrong on two counts; firstly, that there was no such policy and secondly, that it underestimates the real sources of cultural assimilation in the 20th century.

It is true that in January 1940 CEMA stated that "our English cultural activities" constituted "our national tradition", but this does not mean that it was about to embark on an enterprise that no British government had attempted let alone a new, under-funded informal body of uncertain future. In the context of other documents of the time and CEMA's approach to grant-giving, this usage is manifestly an example of the common conflation of England with Britain. 'English' was commonly used to mean 'British' even by Scots and by Tom Jones, who was in no way retiring about his Welshness. More ideologically motivated uses of 'English' were also current and will be discussed later. Similarly, the Board's forgetfulness was a common enough lapse that occurs even now under devolution. David Dickson (though probably speaking of the 1950s) recalled a sign in the Ministry of Education's offices that said 'Remember Scotland!'⁴⁰ Irritating though such amnesia may be, it would amount to an ideology only when joined to a belief that the minority ought to conform by persuasion or coercion to the practice of the majority. That would have required a policy fought

through at government level, not the secret machinations of a department and least of all one that had no remit for Scottish education. The Board clearly had no such designs.

Might there have been, at a less considered level, a shared cultural outlook in CEMA that worked for Scottish cultural assimilation? The evidence again is conclusive, there was not. To a significant degree CEMA grew out of the work of the BIAE, including Williams's plan for a British Art Institute. He had included two Scottish representatives (Charles Kemp being one) in the advisory group that discussed the idea in 1938. When CEMA gave its first grants to Scotland in 1940 they were given to autonomous Scottish bodies, including the Scottish Branch of the BIAE, which pursued their own policies and programmes without interference from London. It supplemented these with directly organised concert and theatre tours of classical music and dramatic productions of varied content, hardly the materials of a cultural invasion.⁴¹ I have found no evidence that CEMA's Scottish audience felt that its cultural identity was under threat; on the contrary, CEMA's productions met a positive welcome. The dominating figure of CEMA in the early years was Tom Jones, and under him no such policy, I suggest, would have been entertained. Jones knew Scotland well, was active in Welsh cultural affairs and proud of the roots that made him something of an outsider in Whitehall. He reputedly greeted the creation of CEMA with the declaration "One up for the Celts!" CEMA's refusal of a grant to the Saltire Society in 1940 on the grounds that it was a front for the SNP, illegitimate though it was and a stain on CEMA's record, is not evidence of a policy of cultural assimilation. It is not even evidence of anti-Scottish feeling. What it expresses is hostility to political nationalism that was very much of its moment. With invasion threatening and Radio Caledonia broadcasting it is easy to see why any (seemingly) political expression of nationalism would be suspect.⁴²

From 1942 CEMA exhibited a different pattern of behaviour, much more determinedly centralist than before. Keynes's cultural chauvinism is undeniable and no doubt influenced his judgement, but the evidence shows that the motive for centralisation was organisational, linked to his primary aim, which was to secure CEMA's post-war future. Had the Scottish Committee not been established at the end of that year, CEMA would have administered Scotland like a region of England despite its expectation to be treated differently. Even had this happened, however, it would not have prevented a Scottish regional office from organising activities in its own area alongside those organised in London, as every English region did. And in any event CEMA did not control the BIAE or its Scottish Branch, which produced their own exhibitions. There is no evidence that CEMA vetted them for conformity to some cultural demand of its own. Even the controversy around the founding of the Scottish Committee reveals no trace that CEMA had a mind to impose an Anglicising policy on Scotland. The exhibitions of the Scottish Committee were, like the Scottish Branch's, freely chosen and preponderantly Scottish in content although funded by CEMA. All these existed side by side with productions brought to Scotland or directly organised in London. The outcome, as my analysis of exhibitions shows, was a more or less healthy pluralism. By 1947 the Arts Council was ready to agree that direct London intervention in Scotland should cease: not the attitude needed to see through the cultural subjugation of a nation. In short, the idea that CEMA expected Scotland to conform to southern cultural norms can be dismissed. Having said this, it must be added that the cultural outlook of the Scottish Committee was in some respects blinkered. It did not, for example, concern itself with indigenous, traditional music, oral culture or writing, and its response to Gaelic culture was, over many years, inadequate. These failings, however, do not amount to evidence that the hegemony of an alien set of cultural values was under construction.

Insulated by his empyrean outlook Keynes was no more interested in English regional traditions or in Welsh culture than in Scottish. Popular culture did not engage him either. His most caustic remarks about Scotland, which shade from condescension into contempt, were provoked by what he considered incessant, excessive demands that threatened his organisation. He and Glasgow felt that the stress the Scots placed on their cultural difference was a tactic to get the maximum from CEMA's funding with the minimum of accountability.⁴³ Glasgow recorded his most intemperate outburst:

I would rather hand them over their share of the money, leaving them to stew in their own feeble juice, than agree to a separatist precedent which would allow them to get the best of both worlds.⁴⁴

This combines the hostility to political nationalism, determination to keep Scotland on a short financial leash and a dose of cultural disdain. Even Glasgow felt it went a little too far. Keynes above all did not want his organisation to be diverted from the goal he had in mind, the artistic glorification of London. Scotland, Wales and the regions of England were all secondary. The danger to Scotland from Keynes's priorities was not assimilation but neglect. The price it paid, in the long run, was loss of investment relative to London. So long as it had the Goschen formula to fall back on, Scotland at least had a guaranteed minimum. After the Scottish Committee agreed in 1953 to set it aside, Keynes's thoroughbred chickens came home to roost in the form of Williams's 'few but roses' policy.⁴⁵ By 1956 opera in London was swallowing 66% of the Council's entire budget, and by 1965 the Scottish allocation had collapsed to 6.3%, little more than half the Goschen level.

That the assimilation of Scottish culture was neither an objective nor an effect of the policy of CEMA or the Arts Council is borne out by one final factor. The most powerful engine of “homogenising and hegemonizing” in capitalist societies is the marketplace.⁴⁶ The economy underpins international business and communications and stimulates labour mobility. It influences policy and changing demand in education. The media and the entertainment industry project cultural influences internationally. All were factors in the period before the war as the testimonies of Edwin Muir and many others show. Assimilatory forces act widely and on a large scale, and have intensified in the decades since, though Scottish identity remains coherent and viable. In proselytising for ‘the living arts’ CEMA and the Arts Council, for all their limitations of finance, reach and outlook, worked against the grain of the ‘mechanised arts’ (as they were called) that were and are powerful sources of homogenisation. The remedies of *The 1919 Report* against such trends were local empowerment, active participation and education. These were the cornerstones of CEMA’s early policy and, despite Keynes, remained powerful ideals in the period of this study.⁴⁷

Scottish Visual Art and Modernism

One other potential assimilatory force faced Scottish art and culture, an ideological projection of late modernism. This was the source of the most immediate anxiety felt by Scottish artists for the future of Scottish art. The frailty but necessity of *The 1919 Report’s* ideal of vigorous ‘regional’ cultures is evident when seen against the juggernaut of modernism no less than in the context of mass communication and markets, yet modernism was itself permeated, like the report, by Idealism. The conception of art as a psychic emanation of reality resonates with the spirit of Schiller and Hegel. Art as an avant-garde leading society towards ultimate perfection (an image

first used by Saint-Simon in the 1820s) has Romantic origins. The artist as seer is Romanticism's secularisation of the priest's insight into divine order. Without Idealism art could not be conceived as trans-historical, nor could Clement Greenberg have theorised modernism as the teleology of art's progressive purification to reveal its inner, abstract, essence.

Scottish art had begun to absorb the impact of modernity before the end of the 19th century, for example in the Kailyard and Celtic Revival movements, which consciously offered antitheses to its troubling social consequences. They asserted the continuity and richness of Scottish culture against the threat of the modernist 'break with tradition'. Charles Rennie Mackintosh and the Scottish Colourists were in early contact with artists in Vienna and Paris respectively, but war interrupted what may have become a wider and more sustained dialogue between Scottish artists and their continental contemporaries. Modernist visual art in Scotland generally remained conservative, moderate and theoretically underdeveloped.⁴⁸ This insipidity suggests that the sense of national crisis fed ambivalence towards modernist optimism. If so, ambivalence was compounded by late modernism's aggressive metropolitanism. Modernist factions sprang up and flourished in cosmopolitan centres where experimentation and rivalry combined with theoretical and ideological argument in volatile social and political milieus: Berlin, Vienna, Zurich, Rome, Moscow and most consistently Paris. The metropolitan authority of modernism (an authority greater for the multiplicity of its competing formations) drew artists to its centres, and provided the standards by which contemporary artistic endeavours were judged. This modernism (despite MacDiarmid's determined assaults) admitted no clear place for those physically distanced from its centres. 'Regional' artists were faced with a dilemma, how to be themselves and yet be

modern, when modernism seemed to bear the message of their historical irrelevance, their supersession by its universality. The regional modernist could seem an oxymoron, one who offered back to modernism only a clumsy and superficial parody of itself.

When married to the Idealist notion of society as an organism and the Romantic conception of art as an emanation of reality, this ideology became doubly problematic for Scotland. In *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948) T. S. Eliot argued that only a handful of major cultures, which possessed organic continuity across considerable stretches of time, could claim a Literature. Eliot had set out the theme in his 1919 essay *Was there a Scottish Literature?* in which he argued that, though evolving from distinctive roots, Scottish literature had effectively now been subsumed into the dominant and organically continuous tradition of the literature of England.⁴⁹ Under this regime, as Craig (1996) has written, Scottish writers had no separate significance as Scottish writing did not have the organic continuity to constitute a value for itself. William Gaunt expressed ideas similar (but with an ethnic undercurrent) in a review entitled *English Painting Today* (1937) that included the Scottish, Welsh and Irish painters Pryde, Grant, John, Brangwyn and Dunlop.⁵⁰ Though some were highly Anglicised, Gaunt noted “racially none are Anglo-Saxon”, but whatever significance the Celtic cultures may have had in the past, they were now only tributary to the dominant English tradition. Modernism compounded the economic forces of assimilation, creating the theoretical and material conditions to deprive Scottish art of value in and for itself. So integrated into this thinking were motifs of organicism and essentialism that conceptual alternatives were not readily available in the general culture. Escape, then, depended on demonstrating the organic continuity and identity of Scottish culture. This, I suggest, is a neglected facet of Idealism’s tendency to make universal claims rest on innate, collective (ultimately national) identities.

From James Caw in 1908 to Ian Finlay in 1947 the identification of distinctive national characteristics was an essential task for writers on Scottish art.⁵¹ Their task was essential in two senses; first, conceptually, they began from the assumption that Scottish identity must have an essence; second, politically, they believed that without it the idea of a Scottish tradition would be exposed as a delusion. The aim was to show that Scottish art possessed an inner unity, however mysterious, that had survived into the present in the form of intuitive predilections which close study could reveal. Depending upon the writer, these were expressed (for example) by rich colour, visual complexity and abstract form. Caw was circumspect about the origins of the national quality of Scottish art (it is “baffling and obscure”), but he was nevertheless certain that it was real. He locates it in an innate love of colour, and in the combination of an “idealistic spirit” with “realism...in the treatment of life and nature”, that originate in Presbyterianism.⁵² This reveals Caw’s debt to the Calvinist perception of divine order interpenetrated but not united with the material world. It hints too at Carlyle’s ‘natural supernaturalism’ and the influence of Scottish dualist philosophy. Writing when already a member of the Scottish Committee, Finlay was as careful as Caw to acknowledge the obscurity of the “national ‘pattern’” of Scottish art. Yet he had larger ambitions, wishing to link contemporary Scottish art seamlessly to the primordial past. In a direct echo of the ideas of Vico and Herder, Finlay suggests that elements such as the love of colour, of contrast and abstract form are attributable to “climate, geography, and race, perhaps in that order of importance”.⁵³ Finlay further elaborates that Scottish art belongs to a northern European sensibility, an idea suggested by Herbert Read in the early 1930s. He proposed that the northern tradition is characterised by an “abstract, ornamental, if often inarticulate style” and by being “impulsive, more personal in appeal, leaving much to the...imagination of the spectator”. It is “dynamic, organic,

questing”, motivated by individualism, intuition and feeling, and attempts to express “the mysteries of life, spirituality and...an essentially feminine genius”. Southern art is “comparatively cold, restrained, impersonal, and aloof”, prefers the bounded and finite, and is “reposeful”, rigid, static, calculated and rational.⁵⁴ In short, Finlay resorts to Nietzsche’s Dionysian and Apollonian categories for his explanatory framework.

An editorial from *Scottish Art and Letters* (1944) shows similar ideas entering the general discourse of Scottish art, like Gaunt assuming an ethnic origin. The writer laments the vulnerability of Scottish artists to the influence of English writers with the power of a “national culture” behind them.⁵⁵ If the Scottish artist is to offer something different from “imported merchandise” Scotland must function as a “critical unit” that takes responsibility for its own cultural life, and not succumb to the idea that all critical standards have their source in London. Scottish writers are “too ready to adapt to [London’s] expectations”. The audience, also taking its standards from London, will not recognise “authentically” Scottish work for what it is. However varied the work of Scottish artists, there is “a certain racial outlook which they all have in common, and of which they are nearly all demonstrably conscious”. The best work will be made when Scottish artists and people are united by the “atavistic unconscious”, which makes “the world’s best artistic work...on examination to be, not cosmopolitan, however international its appeal, but racial and national in the most uncompromising way”.⁵⁶ Such writings suggest a lack of explanatory alternatives to the Gaunt-Eliot ideology. The hand of Idealism is evident as we enter again the territory of the ‘national soul’, the inner spirit possessed by all distinctive cultural formations.

Historically and ethically dubious though such ideas are, they were the common currency of the time, the intellectual foundations on which a positive conception of Scottish art and culture had to be built to withstand the perceived threats of marginalisation and assimilation. They served a political function too, underwriting the expectation that responsibility for Scottish art must rest in Scotland. Scotland could not cede intellectual command of its cultural life to London without accepting that its claims to artistic traditions of its own were empty. But the threats that the Scottish Committee felt itself pitched against were both more pervasive and more nebulous than any policy of CEMA's or the Arts Council's. The issue, ultimately, is a broader one. The social sphere (Poggi writes) is permeated by politics and, as it is there that the identity of the group is produced, it is engaged in "political business of the highest order".⁵⁷ In his discussion of Carl Schmitt, he says:

How can a collectivity discriminate between friend and foe if not by referring to a conception of what makes Us into Us; and how can such a conception be generated except by ordering in some distinctive fashion the internal life of the collectivity?⁵⁸

The production of collective identity lies outside formal political organisation in the domain of civil society. In the production of shared values, 'high art' held a special ideological position as the embodiment of an ideal of freedom beyond material necessity. The advent of war in 1939 pushed questions of national values and identity to the fore. The arts then became emblematic of political freedom, prefiguring the Cold War promotion of Abstract Expressionism as the art of 'the Free World' over and against Soviet Socialist Realism.⁵⁹ The nationalist currents that agitated the Scottish

Committee were seeking outlet through the command of policy in Scotland precisely in Poggi's terms, to order Scotland's "internal life" in its own self-chosen way. Mavor hoped to raise in a wider public a better knowledge of Scottish art, to arouse a sense of pride and identification with it (if not with every part of it). His purpose was to buttress Scottish cultural identity as it entered a new phase, bringing new political opportunities after two difficult decades. Home Rule was the centrepiece of the transformation he hoped for. And despite his claim to be "a Realist of the Scottish Schools" he and the Scottish Committee took as given the Romantic-Idealist conception of art as a universal expressed through finite organic cultures. Mavor wrote for the Committee that:

It has always realised that there is a traditional and individual Scottish outlook on Art, and that this is a branch of nationalism by no means to be neglected or discouraged... While Art belongs to no country or race, it is created by artists in particular places... (It) gains life from the kind of soil that gave those artists birth.⁶⁰

¹ MacDiarmid, letter to Anthony Ross, 22 September 1967, in Bold (Ed.), *The Letters of Hugh MacDiarmid*, (Athens (Ga), University of Georgia, 1984), pp. 871-872.

² Smith, op. cit. p. 244.

³ Beveridge and Turnbull, *The Eclipse of Scottish Culture* (Edinburgh, Polygon, 1989).

⁴ Witts, op. cit. pp. 104-106.

⁵ Raymond Williams, *The Arts Council*, in *Resources of Hope*, op. cit., pp. 41-57.

⁶ I do not mean to discount the working class autodidact tradition, as discussed by Rose.

⁷ Poggi, *The Development of the Modern State*, (London, Hutchinson, 1978), p. 6.

⁸ Ibid. p. 7.

⁹ CEMA Progress Report, 25 January 1940, p. 2, NAS GD 281/51/1.

¹⁰ Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000* (London, Allen Lane, the Penguin Press, 1999), p. 318.

¹¹ By 1939 40% of Scottish households had radios. Glasgow had 127 cinemas. A survey in 1937 of 8,000 children in West Lothian showed that 36% attended the cinema once a week and 25% more than once. Live theatre, including variety theatres, declined (Devine, op. cit. p. 354).

¹² Muir, *Scottish Journey* (London, Heinemann, 1935). This was the second of a series, following J.B. Priestley's *English Journey*, published the year before, which presented England in a similarly 'realistic' light.

¹³ Ibid. p. 24.

¹⁴ Ibid. p. 28. MacDiarmid's objection may have been that Muir did not endorse Home Rule as the solution to Scotland's problems, though he understood that they were at bottom economic.

¹⁵ Harvie, *Scotland and Nationalism* (London, Routledge, 1994), op. cit. pp. 28-29.

¹⁶ Normand, op. cit. p. 41.

¹⁷ Mavor to Porteous, 14 August 1943, NLS Acc. 5798/Box 1/File 2.

¹⁸ Simon (op. cit. pp. 277-278) gives an example from March 1940, when de la Warr suggested that state funding in some form might resolve a crisis in the English public schools. His suggestion was rebuffed by the Provost of Eton as a step towards state control.

¹⁹ Poggi, op. cit. p. 136.

²⁰ Mackay Thomson's reluctance to see an expansion in Scottish secondary education in the post-war period stemmed in part from his concern that the government would not support the SED with additional resources (McPherson and Raab, op. cit. pp 84-85).

²¹ Keynes to Butler, 6 April 1945, KC PP84/3/63-65.

²² Butler to Anderson, 10 May 1945, VA EL2 87.

²³ In 1965 the Arts Council was placed under the Department of Education and Science because Harold Wilson did not believe the Treasury should have spending functions. It remained with the DES until 1983 when it was placed under the Privy Council Office. The original funding anomaly of 1940 was, therefore, reinstated for eighteen years.

²⁴ The description is by Kingsely Martin (in Keynes, M., op. cit. p. 4).

²⁵ Keynes to Glasgow, 25 September 1945, VA EL 2/40.

²⁶ Though lacking the democratic element of election, Mavor's idea for a representative body was not remote from Raymond Williams's in the 1970s.

²⁷ That Parker deliberately intended this phrase to make possible some delegation of power to the Scottish Committee is made clear in his memorandum to Mackay Thomson, 7 September 1945 (NAS ED 61/28).

²⁸ Gramsci makes clear that the term 'hegemony' cannot be used separately from political power. The implication is that the political leadership is unified on economic, political and cultural 'fronts'. This seems a suspect claim for other than authoritarian states (Gramsci, in Forgacs (Ed.), *The Antonio Gramsci Reader* (London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1999, p. 194).

²⁹ The phrase is the art critic Lawrence Alloway's (Hewison, op. cit. pp. 135-136).

³⁰ Pearson, op. cit. pp.100-103.

³¹ "Every relationship of hegemony is necessarily an educational relationship" (Gramsci, in Forgacs, op. cit. p. 348).

³² Burger, *The Negation of the Autonomy of Art by the Avant-Garde*, in Docherty, *Postmodernism, A Reader* (Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993).

³³ Perkin, op. cit. p.117.

³⁴ Ibid. pp. 12-91.

³⁵ Ibid. pp. 258-281. Rose discusses CEMA on p. 204 and p. 234.

³⁶ Rose, op. cit. pp. 8-9.

³⁷ For example, in the late 1930s, there was a strong demand from working class radio listeners for classical music (Rose, op. cit. p. 204).

³⁸ One strand of visual modernism, deriving largely from Duchamp's 'ready-mades', embodied a powerful conceptual challenge to Idealist notions of absolute aesthetic value, but only found a significant response in Britain in the post-war period. This reflected the changing culture that I suggest CEMA and the Arts Council played a part in creating.

³⁹ Smith, op. cit. p. 244.

⁴⁰ Quoted in McPherson and Raab, op. cit. pp.185-86.

⁴¹ The actor Duncan Macrae appeared in a number of CEMA-sponsored dramas during the war. He was a nationalist and spoke publicly for the SNP during the 1945 Motherwell bye-election campaign.

⁴² Jones must have at least endorsed the decision. He may have been especially sensitive on this point, as he had been tainted by association with appeasement. He was candid that his failure to see the danger of Hitler before 1938 had been his greatest mistake. His strong opposition to the creation of a Welsh Office in the later 1940s made him something of a hate figure for Welsh nationalists. But his devotion to Welsh culture was never in question.

⁴³ That the Scots were aware of this perception was recorded by Mary Fox (Fox to Glasgow, 13 August 1945, VA EL 3/94).

⁴⁴ Glasgow, in Keynes, M., op. cit. p. 268.

⁴⁵ Williams by then was Secretary-General, and not the egalitarian he had been in the 1930s.

⁴⁶ Poggi, op. cit. p. 121.

⁴⁷ Kenyes's preference, sustained until 1945, for keeping the Arts Council linked to Education should be remembered.

⁴⁸ Normand (p. 5) discusses the relative absence of radical, conceptual modernism in Scotland and the countervailing strength of the narrative tradition.

⁴⁹ Eliot, *Was there a Scottish Literature?* (*The Atheneum*, August 1919) in McCulloch, *Modernism and Nationalism* (Glasgow University Press, 2004). Eliot's references to "English literature" do not mean

English-language literature in the general sense. The Idealist foundations of his line of thinking are striking.

⁵⁰ *The Studio*, Vol. 113, January-June 1937, p. 295. The December 1936 issue of *The Studio* was about art in Scotland, with articles by Cursiter, Harvey Wood and Ian Finlay. Another Scottish issue in 1943 had an article by Honeyman. Important though these were as opportunities to state the case for a Scottish tradition, they did not overcome the fear of the attitude represented by Gaunt.

⁵¹ John Tonge and J. D. Fergusson could be added.

⁵² Caw, op. cit. pp. 231-232 and pp. 471-472.

⁵³ Finlay, *Art in Scotland* (Oxford University Press, 1948), pp. 2-3.

⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 5.

⁵⁵ R. Crombie Saunders, editorial in *Scottish Art and Letters*, No. 1, 1944, p. 3.

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 4.

⁵⁷ Poggi, op. cit. p. 11.

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 12.

⁵⁹ The use of Abstract Expressionism by the CIA during the 1950s is well documented. For example, see Crow, *Modern Art in the Common Culture* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press), 1996, Chapter 2.

⁶⁰ Essay for *The Scottish Modern Art Association* (first collection), 1944, NLS Dep. 355/535.

Appendices

APPENDIX ONE: Council and Scottish Committee Members

CEMA Council Members, 10 April 1940

Lord Macmillan (Chairman)
Dr. Thomas Jones
Sir Kenneth Barnes
Sir Kenneth Clark
Sir Walford Davies
Margery Fry
Thelma Cazalet Keir MP
James Wilkie (not ratified)
Unnamed Carnegie UK Trustee
(not ratified)

Secretary: Mary Glasgow

CEMA Council Members May 1940

Lord Macmillan (Chairman)
Dr. Thomas Jones
Sir Kenneth Barnes
Sir Kenneth Clark
The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres
Sir Walford Davies
Margery Fry
Thelma Cazalet Keir MP

Secretary: Mary Glasgow

Arts Council of Great Britain Council Members, 1945-46

Lord Keynes (Chairman)
Ivor Brown
Sir Kenneth Clark
Viscount Esher
Benjamin Ifor Evans
Thelma Cazalet Keir
Sir Stanley Marchant
Osborne Mavor ('James Bridie')
Ralph Vaughan Williams

Secretary-General: Mary Glasgow

ACGB Council Members, Royal Charter, 1946

Sir Ernest Pooley (Chairman)
Ivor Brown
Sir Lewis Casson
Sir Kenneth Clark
Viscount Esher
Benjamin Ifor Evans
Barbara Ayrton Gould
Lord Harlech
Thelma Cazalet Keir
Sir Stanley Marchant
Odborne Mavor/James Welsh
Ralph Vaughan Williams
W.E. Williams

Secretary-General: Mary Glasgow
Asst. Secretary-General: Eric White

**Scottish Committee Members
1943-1947**

Scottish Committee of CEMA

1943-44

Dr. O. H. Mavor (Chairman)
Professor Ernest Bullock
Dr. T. J. Honeyman
Sir William McKechnie
Sir George Pirie
Dr. J. R. Peddie
Neil Shaw (from October)

1944-45

Dr. O. H. Mavor (Chairman)
Professor Ernest Bullock
Dr. T. J. Honeyman
Sir William McKechnie
Sir George Pirie
Dr. J. R. Peddie
Neil Shaw

**Scottish Committee of CEMA/the
Arts Council**

1945-46

Dr. O. H. Mavor (Chairman)
Professor Ernest Bullock
Dr. T. J. Honeyman
Sir William McKechnie
Sir George Pirie
Dr. J. R. Peddie
Neil Shaw

**Scottish Committee of the Arts
Council**

1946-47

Dr. James Welsh (Chairman)
Professor Ernest Bullock
Ian Finlay
Eric Linklater
Dr. O. H. Mavor
Dr. J. R. Peddie
Eva, Countess Rosebery
Neil Shaw

APPENDIX TWO: Tables

Table 1: Exhibitions in Scotland, 1940-46 (April-March)

N: New exhibition; SB: Scottish Branch; SC: Scottish Committee

1940-41	Title			Venues and Centres
May-Aug.	Contemporary Scottish and French Paintings (N) (SB)			Inverurie High School; Aberdeen Art Gallery; Stonehaven (Mackie Academy)
Feb.	Autographic Prints (N) (BIAE) ¹			Dundee (Grey Lodge)
Total	2 exhibitions	2 new	4 + showings	4 identifiable different venues 4 identifiable different centres

1941-42	Title			Venues and Centres
May-Sept.	The Art of the Allies (N) (British Council, Scotland)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove
June-July	Scottish Paintings (N) (SB)			Ayr (unknown venue), Kilmarnock (Dick Institute)
July - March	Modern Scottish, French and English Painting ² (N) (SB)			Montrose (Upper Memorial Hall); Dundee Art Gallery
Sept. – March	Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists (N) (BIAE) Though produced in Scotland, this was directly commissioned by the BIAE, not the Scottish Branch			Rolls Royce, Hillington; Lewis’s, Glasgow; Munitions factory (unidentified), Glasgow; Glasgow Police HQ; Weir’s Ltd, Glasgow; Royal Ordnance Factory, Cardonald; Bilsland Brothers, Glasgow; Royal Ordnance Factory, Bishopton
Oct.–Jan.	Modern Paintings (N) (SB)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Rosyth Dockyard
Oct. - ?	Living in Cities (N) (BIAE)			Multiple unidentified Scottish Command centres
?	Unknown Art for the People exhibition(s) (BIAE?) ³			Lanark, Stirling, Greenock, Perth Galashiels
Jan.	Plan Scotland Now (N) (SB)			Whitecrook Hostel, Clydebank
Total	7 exhibitions	7 new	23 + showings	14 identifiable different venues in 17 identifiable different centres

1942-43	Title			Venues and Centres
April-	Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists (BIAE)			Yorkhill Dock canteen, Glasgow; Rothesay Dock canteen, Clydebank; YMCA Hostel, Bishopton
April–Dec.	Plan Scotland Now (SB)			Aberdeen Art Gallery; National Gallery, Edinburgh; Ayr, Kilmarnock, Dumfries, Stranraer, Dundee (unidentified); Orkney and Shetland (unidentified); Edinburgh ATS, OCTU; Dalkeith (Newbattle Abbey)
April-Dec.	Modern Paintings (SB)			Paisley Art Gallery; Cowdenbeath Miners’ Institute; St. Andrews (Old Parliament Hall); Kelso High School; Dick Institute, Kilmarnock; Ayr (Bennett’s Art Salon)
May–Jan.	Living in Cities (BIAE)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Ayr, Kilmarnock; Dumfries; Stranraer, Dundee (unidentified); Orkney and Shetland (Sept. unidentified); Kirkwall (Jan.)
July–Sept.	War Artists II (N) (BIAE)			Glasgow Police HQ; Paisley Art Gallery; Montrose Town Hall; Aberdeen Art Gallery
Sept. - March	Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists 2 (N) (BIAE) Though produced in Scotland, this was commissioned by the BIAE.			Stewart and Lloyd Ltd., Mossend (Paisley); Rolls Royce, Hillington; Bilsland Brothers Ltd. Glasgow; Yorkhill Dock canteen, Glasgow; Rothesay Dock canteen, Clydebank
Jan.	Scottish Artists (N) (SB)			Galashiels (British Restaurant)
Feb. - March	CEMA Collection (N) (CEMA)			Dundee Art Gallery
March - April	Original Prints (N) (BIAE)			Paisley Art Gallery
Total	9 exhibitions	5 new	41+ showings	20 identifiable different venues 20 identifiable different centres

1943-44	Title			Venues and Centres
April -	Original Prints (BIAE)			Aberdeen Art Gallery
April– Oct.	Modern Painting and Sculpture (N) (SB)			Edinburgh ATS centre; Inverness (unidentified: 2 showings); Dalkeith (Newbattle Abbey); Army unit (unidentified); Scottish Command Education Office, Edinburgh; Troon ⁴
April- June	Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists 2 (BIAE)			YMCA club, Shandon; Rushyhill; Bearsden (canteens); RAF base, Wigtownshire
April- July	Lithographs (N) (BIAE)			AA Unit, Fife; Inverness (Raigmore Hospital); Argyllshire (unidentified); Aberdeenshire (unidentified)
May- June	Tate Gallery Wartime Acquisitions (N) (CEMA)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove
May -	Original Contemporary Prints (N) (BIAE)			Galashiels Academy; ATS Centre (unidentified); Strathpeffer (unidentified); ATS Centre (unidentified)
May– Sept.	Plan Scotland Now (SB)			Montrose Memorial Hall; WEA Summer School, St. Andrews; Dunfermline Professional and Business Women’s Club
July– Feb.	The Artist at Work (N) (SB) (large version)			Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove; Dundee Albert Institute; Aberdeen Art Gallery; Paisley Art Gallery; National Gallery, Edinburgh; Perth Art Gallery
Aug.–Sep.	The Present Discovers the Past (N) (CEMA)			Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove
Oct.– Dec.	Theatre Décor (N) (CEMA)			Park Theatre, Glasgow; Perth Repertory Theatre; Dundee Repertory Theatre
Oct.– Nov.	Philip Wilson Steer (N) (CEMA)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Aberdeen Art Gallery
Dec.	Rebuilding Britain (N) (CEMA)			Gas company showroom, Greenock
Dec.	English Art and the Mediterranean (N) (Warburg Institute toured by CEMA)			Dundee Art Gallery
Dec. - March	Royal Academy 1943 Selection (N) (CEMA)			Dundee Art Gallery; Paisley Art Gallery
March	19 th Century Scottish Paintings (N) (SB) ⁵			Dumfries Academy
Total	15 exhibitions	12 new	42+ showings	25 identifiable different venues 18 identifiable different centres

1944-45	Title			Venues and Centres
Apr. – June	Ballet Design (N) (CEMA)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Dundee Albert Institute; Aberdeen Art Gallery
April – Oct.	19 th Century Scottish Paintings (SB)			Factory canteen (unidentified); factory canteen, Glasgow; factory (unidentified); transport workers’ canteen, Glasgow; transport workers’ canteen, Glasgow
May – March.	Design in Daily Life (N) (BIAE) (small version)			Glasgow School of Art; Edinburgh College of Art; Dundee Art Gallery; Perth Art Gallery; Huntly (Gordons School); Aberdeenshire towns and villages (unidentified); Banffshire; Angus (unidentified)
May	Paul Nash: Applied Design (N) (CEMA)			Perth Art Gallery
July- April	Contemporary Scottish Paintings (N) (SB)			Inverness Town Hall; Stornoway (Martin’s Memorial Hall); Dingwall Academy; Aberdeen Art Gallery; Buckie, Banff, Keith (unidentified); Paisley Art Gallery; Edinburgh (Saltire Society)
July – Oct.	The Glasgow School (N) (SC)			Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove; National Gallery, Edinburgh

July – Jan.	Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection (N) (SC)			Brechin High School; Dundee Art Gallery; Paisley Art Gallery; Bell Baxter High School, Cupar; Perth Art Gallery; Eyemouth Youth House; Arbroath Library
Aug. -	British Narrative Paintings from the Tate Gallery (N) (CEMA)			Perth Art Gallery; Dundee Albert Institute
Sept.– Jan.	The Wyndham Vint Collection (N) (CEMA)			Kirkwall Art Club; Stromness Army Education Centre; Aberdeen Art Gallery; Dundee Art Gallery; Edinburgh Youth House
Nov. -	Oriental Prints (N) (SB)			Glasgow transport workers’ canteen (tour)
Dec.	Ideas on Design in the Home (N) (BIAE)			Cowdenbeath (Moss Side Junior Secondary School)
Feb. - March	The London Group (N) (SC)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Glasgow School of Art; Dumfries Academy
Total	12 exhibitions	11 new	47+ showings ⁶	24 identifiable different venues 21 identifiable different centres

1945-46	Title			Venues and Centres
March – Sept.	Drawings and Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists (N) (SB)			National Gallery, Edinburgh; Kilmarnock (Dick Institute); Inverness Town Hall
April – Aug.	The London Group (SC)			Aberdeen Art Gallery; Stonehaven (Mackie Academy); Brechin High School; Bell Baxter High School, Cupar
April - Sept.	Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection (SC)			Girvan (British Restaurant); Troon (Municipal Golf Club); Ayr; Falkirk Academy; Wick High School; Thurso (Miller Academy); West Linton (Graham Institute)
April – Sept.	The Glasgow School (SC)			Kilmarnock (Dick Institute); Kirkcaldy Art Gallery; Aberdeen Art Gallery; Prestwick (church hall); Hawick High School
April - July	Contemporary Scottish Painting (SB)			Helensburgh (Granary Tea Rooms); Ardeer (ICI factory); Perth Junior High School
July	The Vint Collection (CEMA)			Eyemouth Youth House
July– April.	The Artist at Work (small version) *Though produced by the SB, this exhibition was transferred to CEMA’s programme in 1944. It remains counted here under the SB as being originated by it. (N) (SB)			Kincardineshire (unidentified); Banchory High School; Keith (new school hall); Buckie High School; Banff Academy; St. Andrews (10 Greyfriars Gardens); Glasgow (Saltire Society Club); Eyemouth Youth House; Galashiels Academy
Sept. - March	Royal Scottish Academy 1945 Selection (N) (SC)			Montrose Guildhall; Paisley Art Gallery; Stranraer (the Ritz Hall); Kingussie (St. Columba Hall)
Sept.– Oct.	French Book Illustration (N) (CEMA)			Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove; Edinburgh College of Art
Oct.	Syncopies of Ballet (N) (CEMA)			Edinburgh (King’s Theatre)
Oct.– Nov.	Acquisitions of the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (N) (CEMA)			Dundee Art Gallery
Jan.	Contemporary Swedish Painting (N) (SC)			Aberdeen Art Gallery
Jan. - March	The McInnes Collection (N) (SC)			Arbroath Art Gallery; Dundee Art Gallery
Jan.– Feb.	Picasso and Matisse (N) (BC/CEMA)			Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove
Jan.	Your House and Mine (N) (BIAE)			Lochgelly Girls’ Club
March	Prints and Print Making (N) (BIAE)			Cupar (Bell Baxter High School)
Total	16 exhibitions	11 new	46+ showings ⁷	38 identifiable different venues 31 identifiable different centres

Table 2: Total of new exhibitions, showings, different venues and centres, 1940-46		
New Exhibitions	Showings	Venues and Centres
48	203+	85 venues in 58 centres

Table 3: New exhibitions by producer, 1940-46

Year	BIAE	Scottish Branch	British Council	CEMA	Scottish Committee
1940-41	1	1	0	0	0
1941-42	2	4	1	0	0
1942-43	3	1	0	1	0
1943-44	2	3	0	7	0
1944-45	2	2	0	4	3
1945-46	2	2	1	3	3
Totals	12	13	2	15	6

Table 4: New exhibitions shown in Scotland, as percentages compared to British totals, 1940-45

Year	Scottish Total	British Total
1940-41	2 (14%)	14
1941-42	7 (39%)	18
1942-43	5 (13%)	39
1943-44	12 (19%)	63
1944-45	11 (14%)	79

Table 5
Scottish-produced new exhibitions as compared to London-produced exhibitions shown in Scotland, 1940-45

Year	Scottish Total	London Total	British Total
1940-41	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	14
1941-42	5 (28%)	1 (6%)	18
1942-43	2 (5%)	3 (8%)	39
1943-44	4(6%)	8(13%)	63
1944-45	5 (6%)	6(8%)	79

Table 6
Identifiable showings in Scotland as percentages of England and Wales totals, 1940-45

Year	Scotland Total showings	England and Wales Total Showings (100%)
1940-41	4 (3.6%)	112
1941-42	23 (20%)	115
1942-43	41 (10.8%)	379
1943-44	42 (7.0%)	581
1944-45	47 (6.6%)	730
Total	157 (8.1%)	1917

Table 7
BIAE/Scottish Branch ; CEMA/Scottish Committee showings in Scotland, 1940-46

Year	BIAE/SB	CEMA/SC
1940-41	4 (100%)	0
1941-42	21 (91%)*	0
1942-43	40 (97.5%)	1 (2.5%)
1943-44	31(71.4%)	12 (28.6%)
1944-45	24 (52%)	23 (48%)
1945-46	24 (53%)	21 (47%)

Table 8: Annual total of identifiable showings by producer, 1940-46

Year	BIAE	Scottish Branch	British Council	CEMA	Scottish Committee
1940-41	1	3	0	0	0
1941-42	14	7	2	0	0
1942-43	22	18	0	1	0
1943-44	13	18	0	12	0
1944-45	9	15	0	11	12
1945-46	2	22	1	5	16
Totals	61	83	3	29	28

I attribute the five unknown BIAE/Scottish Branch showings in 1941 to the BIAE, but some were probably Scottish Branch.

Table 9: Exhibitions with particular Scottish content, 1940-46

Year Originated	Title	Total Showings
1940-41	Contemporary Scottish and French Paintings (SB)	3
1941-42	Scottish Paintings (N) (SB)	2+
	Modern Scottish, French and English Painting (SB)	2+
	Modern Paintings (SB)	
	Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists (BIAE)	8
	Plan Scotland Now (SB)	11
1942-43		15
	Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists 2 (BIAE)	9
1943-44	Scottish Artists (SB)	1
	Contemporary Painting and Sculpture (SB)	7
1944-45	19 th Century Scottish Paintings (N) (SB)	6
	Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection (SC)	14
	The Glasgow School (N) (SC)	7
	Contemporary Scottish Paintings (N) (SB)	12
1945-46	Drawings and Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists (N) (SB?)	3
	Royal Scottish Academy 1945 Selection (SC)	4
	The McInnes Collection (N) (SC)	2
Totals	16 exhibitions	106+ showings

Table 10: Breakdown of exhibitions by content, 1940-46

Key:
~ BIAE
Scottish Branch of BIAE
* CEMA
+ Scottish Committee of CEMA
^ British Council (Scotland)
Recent or Contemporary Painting (or predominantly painting)

Title	Showings
# Contemporary Scottish and French Paintings (1940)	3
^The Art of the Allies (1941)	2
# Scottish Paintings (1941)*	2+
# Modern Scottish, French and English Painting (1941-42)	2+
~ Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists I (1941-42)	11
# Modern Paintings (1941-42)	8
~ War Artists 2 (1942)	4
~ Scottish Scenes by Scottish Artists 2 (1942-43)	9
# Scottish Artists (1943)	1
# Modern Painting and Sculpture (1943)	7
* CEMA Collection (1943)	1
* Tate Gallery Wartime Acquisitions (1943)	2
* Philip Wilson Steer (1943)	2

* Royal Academy 1943 Selection (1943-44)		2
+ Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection (1944-45)		14
# Contemporary Scottish Paintings (1944-45)		12
* The Wyndham Vint Collection (1944-45)		6
+ The London Group (1945)		7
# Drawings and Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists (1945)		3
+ Royal Scottish Academy 1945 Selection (1945-46)		4
+ Contemporary Swedish Painting (1946)		1
* Picasso and Matisse (1946)		1
Total	22 exhibitions	104+ showings

Historical (or predominantly historical) Painting

Title		Showings
* British Narrative Paintings from the Tate Gallery (1944)		2
# 19 th Century Scottish Paintings (1944)		6
+The Glasgow School (1944-45)		7
* Acquisitions of the Walker Art Gallery (1945)		1
+ The McInnes Collection (1946)		2
Total	5 exhibitions	18 showings

Printmaking

Title		Showings
~ Autographic Prints (1940)		1+
~ Lithographs (1943)		4+
~ Original Prints (1943)		2
~ Original Contemporary Prints (1943)		4
# Oriental Prints (1944)		1+
~ Prints and Print-Making (1945)		1+
Total	6 exhibitions	13+ showings

Illustration

Title		Showings
* French Book Illustration (1945)		2
Totals	1 exhibition	2 showings

Design

Title		Showings
* Theatre Décor (1943)		3
~ Design in Daily Life (1944-45)		8+
* Paul Nash: Applied Design (1944)		1
* Ballet Design (1944)		3
~ Ideas on Design in the Home (1944)		1
* Syncopies of Ballet (1945)		1
~ Your House and Mine (1946)		1
Total	7 exhibitions	18+ showings

Town Planning

Title		Showings
~ Living in Cities (1941-43)		10+
# Plan Scotland Now (1942-43)		15
* Rebuilding Britain (1943)		1
Totals	3 exhibitions	26+ showings

Interpretative

Title		Showings
* The Present Discovers the Past (1943)		1
* English Art and the Mediterranean (1943, photos)		1
# The Artist at Work (1943-46)		6
# The Artist at Work (1943-46) (small version)		9+
Totals	3 exhibitions	17+ showings

The five un-attributable 1941-42 showings are excluded from these tables.

Table 11: Individual main gallery totals, 1940-46

Gallery	Showings
Aberdeen Art Gallery	12
Dick Institute, Kilmarnock	4
Dundee Art Gallery (Albert Institute)	12
Glasgow Art Gallery, Kelvingrove	7
Kirkcaldy Art Gallery	1
National Galleries of Scotland	11
Paisley Art Gallery	8
Perth Art Gallery	5
Total	60

Table 12: Major Scottish gallery showings, 1940-46

Year	Showings	Art Gallery
1940-41	1	Aberdeen Art Gallery (1)
1941-42	5	Dick Institute, Kilmarnock (1); Dundee Art Gallery (1); Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow (1); National Galleries of Scotland (2)
1942-43	9	Aberdeen Art Gallery (2); Dick Institute, Kilmarnock (1); Dundee Art Gallery (1); National Galleries of Scotland (2); Paisley Art Gallery (3)
1943-44	15	Aberdeen Art Gallery (3); Dundee Art Gallery (2); Dundee Albert Institute (1); Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow (3); National Galleries of Scotland (3); Paisley Art Gallery (2); Perth Art Gallery (1)
1944-45	18	Aberdeen Art Gallery (3); Dundee Art Gallery (3); Dundee Albert Institute (2); Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow (1); National Galleries of Scotland (3); Paisley Art Gallery (2); Perth Art Gallery (4)
1945-46	12	Aberdeen Art Gallery (3); Dick Institute, Kilmarnock (2); Dundee Art Gallery (2); Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow (2); Kirkcaldy Art Gallery (1); National Galleries of Scotland (1); Paisley Art Gallery (1)
Total	60	34 exhibitions

Table 13: Exhibitions by Art Gallery, 1940-46

Gallery	Year	Exhibition
Aberdeen Art Gallery	1940-41	Contemporary Scottish and French Paintings
	1942-43	Plan Scotland Now; War Artists II
	1943-44	Original Prints; The Artist at Work; Philip Wilson Steer; Ballet Design; Contemporary Scottish Paintings;
	1944-45	Wyndham Vint Collection
	1945-46	The London Group; The Glasgow School; Contemporary Swedish Painting
Dick Institute, Kilmarnock	1941-42	Scottish Paintings
	1942-43	Modern Paintings
	1945-46	Drawings and Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists; The Glasgow School
Dundee Art Gallery (and Albert Institute)	1941-42	Modern Scottish, French and English Paintings;
	1942-43	CEMA Collection; English Art and the Mediterranean; Royal Academy 1943 Selection
	1943-44	The Artist at Work (Albert Institute)
	1944-45	Design in Daily Life; Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection; Vint Collection
	1945-46	Acquisitions of the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool; Ballet Design (Albert Institute); British Narrative Paintings from the Tate Gallery (Albert Institute) The McInnes Collection
Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow	1941-42	The Art of the Allies
	1943-44	Tate Gallery Wartime Acquisitions; The Artist at Work'; The Present Discovers the Past
	1944-45	The Glasgow School; French Book Illustration;
	1945-46	Picasso and Matisse
Kirkcaldy Art Gallery	1944-45	The Glasgow School

National Galleries of Scotland	1941-42 1942-43 1943-44 1944-45 1945-46	The Art of the Allies; Modern Paintings Plan Scotland Now; Living in Cities Tate Gallery Wartime Acquisitions; The Artist at Work: Philip Wilson Steer Ballet Design; The Glasgow School; The London Group Drawings & Watercolours by Living Scottish Artists
Paisley Art Gallery	1942-43 1943-44 1944-45 1945-46	Modern Paintings; War Artists II; Original Prints The Artist at Work; Royal Academy 1943 Selection Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection Contemporary Scottish Paintings Royal Scottish Academy 1945 Selection
Perth Art Gallery	1943-44 1944-45	The Artist at Work Design in Daily Life; Paul Nash: Applied Design; Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection; British Narrative Paintings from the Tate Gallery

Table 14: Exhibitions shown in art galleries only, 1940-46

Year	Title	Showings
1941-42	The Art of the Allies (British Council)	2
1942-43	CEMA Collection (CEMA)	1
	Original Prints (BIAE)	2
1943-44	Tate Gallery Wartime Acquisitions (CEMA)	2
	The Artist at Work (large version) (SB)	
	The Present Discovers the Past (CEMA)	6
	Philip Wilson Steer (CEMA)	1
	English Art and the Mediterranean (CEMA)	2
	Royal Academy 1943 Selection (CEMA)	1
		2
1944-45	Ballet Design (CEMA)	3
	Paul Nash: Applied Design (CEMA)	1
	British Narrative Paintings from the Tate Gallery (CEMA)	2
1945-46	Acquisitions of the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (CEMA)	1
	Contemporary Swedish Painting (SC)	1
	The McInnes Collection (SC)	2
	Picasso and Matisse (CEMA)	1
Sub-totals	British Council	1
	BIAE:	1
	Scottish Branch	1
	CEMA:	11
	Scottish Committee	2
Total	16 exhibitions	30 showings

Table 15: Scottish centres where exhibitions (other than reproductions) were shown, 1940-46

- + Edinburgh and Glasgow
- > Centres, 100,000-200,000
- ^ Centres, 50,000-100,000
- ~ Centres, 20,000-50,000
- * Centres, 0-20,000

Centre	Showings	Centre	Showings
>Aberdeen	12	~Inverness	5
*Arbroath	2	*Inverurie	1
*Ardeer	1	*Kelso	1
~Ayr	5	*Keith	2
*Banchory	1	~Kilmarnock	6
*Banff	2	*Kingussie	1
*Bearsden	1	~Kirkcaldy	1
*Bishopton	2	*Kirkwall	2
*Brechin	2	*Lanark	1
*Buckie	2	*Lochgelly	1
*Cardonald	1	*Montrose	4
~Clydebank	3	^Paisley	9
*Cowdenbeath	2	~Perth	8
*Cupar	3	*Prestwick	1
*Dalkeith	2	*Rosyth	1
*Dingwall	1	*Rushyhill (nr. Bishopbriggs)	1
~Dunfermline	1	*Shandon	1
~Dumfries	3	~Stirling	1
>Dundee	16	*Stonehaven	2
+Edinburgh	19	*Stornoway	1
*Eyemouth	3	*Stranraer	3
~Falkirk	1	*St. Andrews	3
*Galashiels	4	*Strathpeffer	1
*Girvan	1	*Stromness	1
+Glasgow	24	*Troon	2
^Greenock	2	*Thurso	1
*Hawick	1	*West Linton	1
*Helensburgh	1	*Wick	1
* Hillington	2		
* Huntly	1		
Total 184			

Table 16: Counties where exhibitions (other than reproductions) were shown but venues not identified, 1940-46

Aberdeen	2
Angus	1
Argyll	1
Banff	1
Fife (AA Unit)	1
Kincardine	1
Orkney	2
Shetland	2
Wigtown (RAF Unit)	1
Total 9 counties; 12+ showings	

Table 17: Venues unidentified with any location where exhibitions (other than reproductions) were shown, 1940-46

Army Unit	1
ATS Centres	2
Factories	3+
Scottish Command Centres	1+
Total 4 venues; 7+ showings	

Table 18: Showings in identifiable armed services bases, 1940-46

Army unit (unidentified)
ATS Centre (unidentified)
ATS Centre (unidentified)
AA Unit, Fife (unidentified)
Dalkeith (Newbattle Abbey)
Dalkeith (Newbattle Abbey)
Edinburgh ATS, OCTU
Edinburgh ATS centre
Edinburgh, Scottish Command Education Office
Rosyth Naval Dockyard
Rushyhill (RAF and army base near Bishopbriggs; map sp. 'Rushiehill')
Wigtownshire (RAF base)
Stromness Army Education Centre, Orkney
Scottish Command centres (multiple; unidentified)
Total 14+

Table 19: Showings (1940-46) related to Populations of Burghs and Counties

These tables discount exhibitions in armed services bases to which the public was not admitted. Exhibitions in factories are included because their workforces belonged to the general population. Population figures are taken from the 1931 Census of Scotland, unless otherwise noted. Because of wartime shifts in population they should be treated as approximations. Parish populations are not included to avoid over-complexity, but would provide additional population to the figures given for burghs. County populations (B) include all named burghs.

Wigtown

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Stranraer	3	1.5%	6,572	0.1%	29,331	0.6%

Dumfries

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population	% Scottish Population
Dumfries	3	1.5%	22,795	0.5%	81,047	1.7%

Roxburgh

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Hawick	1	0.5%	17,059	0.4%		
Kelso	1	0.5%	3,855	0.1%		
Totals	2	1.0%	20,914	0.5%	45,788	0.9%

Selkirk

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Galashiels	4	1.8%	13,102	0.3%	22,608	0.4%

Berwick

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population	% Scottish Population
Eyemouth	3	1.5%	2,231	0.05%	26,612	0.5%

Midlothian

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Edinburgh	16	7.9%	439,010	9.1%	526,296	10.9%

Peebles

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
West Linton	1	0.5%	1,200	0.02%	15,051	0.3%

Ayr

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Ayr	5	2.5%	36,783	0.8%		
Girvan	1	0.5%	5,292	0.1%		
Kilmarnock	6	2.9%	38,100	0.8%		
Prestwick	1	0.5%	8,538	0.2%		
Ardeer	1	0.5	-	-		
Troon	2	1.0%	8,544	0.2%		
Totals	16	7.9%	97,275	2.0%	285,217	5.9%

Lanark

Centre	No. of showings	% of all showings	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Lanark	1	0.5%	6,187	0.1%		
Glasgow	24	11.8%	1,088,421	22.5%		
Totals	25	12.3%	1,094,608	22.6	1,586,047	32.7%

Renfrew

Centre	No. of Showings	% of all Exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Greenock	2	1.0%	78,949	1.6%		
Paisley	9	4.4%	86,445	1.8%		
Bishopton	2	1.0%	5,177*	0.1%		
Hillington	2	1.0%	?	?		
Cardonald	1	0.5%	?	?		
Totals	16	7.9%	170,349+	3.5%+	288,536	6.0%

Dunbarton

Centre	No. of Showings	% of all Exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Bearsden	1	0.5%	-	-		
Clydebank	3	1.5%	46,952	1.0%		
Helensburgh	1	0.5%	8,893	0.2%		
Shandon	1	0.5%	?	?		
Totals	6	3.0%	55,845+	1.2%	147,744	3.1%

Argyll

Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Unidentified	1	0.5%	-	-	63,050	1.3%

Stirling						
Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Falkirk	1	0.5%	36,566	0.8%		
Stirling	1	0.5%	22,593	0.5%		
Totals	2	1.0%	59,159	1.2%	166,447	3.4%

Perth						
Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Perth	8	3.9%	34,807	0.7%	120,793	2.5%

Fife						
Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Cowdenbeath	2	1.0%	12,732	0.3%		
Cupar	3	1.5%	4,595	0.1%		
Dunfermline	1	0.5%	35,085	0.7%		
Kirkcaldy	1	0.5%	43,874	1.0%		
Lochgelly	1	0.5%	9,298	0.2%		
St. Andrews	3	1.5%	8,269	0.2%		
Totals	11	5.5%	113,853	2.4%	276,368	5.7%

Angus						
Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Arbroath	2	1.0%	17,635	0.4%		
Brechin	2	1.05	6,840	0.1%		
Dundee	16	7.9%	175,585	3.6%		
Montrose	4	2.0%	10,196	0.2%		
Unidentified	1	0.5%	-	-		
Totals	25	12.3%	210,526	4.3%	270,190	5.6%

Kincardine						
Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Stonehaven	2	1.0%	4,185	0.09%		
Banchory	1	0.5%	1,690	0.03%		
Unidentified	1	0.5%	-	-		
Totals	4	2.0%	5,875	0.1%	39,865	0.8%

Aberdeen						
Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Aberdeen	12	5.9%	167,258	3.4%		
Huntly	1	0.5%	3,779	0.1%		
Inverurie	1	0.5%	4,524	0.1%		
Unidentified	2	1.0%	-	-		
Totals	16	7.9%	175,561	3.6%	300,436	6.2%

Banff						
Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Banff	2	1.0%	3,489	0.1%		
Buckie	2	1.0%	8,689	0.2%		
Keith	2	1.0%	4,424	0.1%		
Unidentified	1	0.5%	-	-		
Totals	7	3.4%	16,602	0.3%	54,907	1.1%

Inverness

Centre	No. of Showings	% of all Exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Inverness	5	2.5%	22,583	0.5%		
Kingussie	1	0.5%	1,067	0.02%		
Totals	6	3.0%	23,650	0.52%	82,108	1.7%

Ross and Cromarty

Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Dingwall	1	0.5%	2,553	0.1%		
Strathpeffer	1	0.5%	?	?		
Stornoway	1	0.5%	3,770	0.1%		
Totals	3	1.5%	6,323	0.2%	62,799	1.3%

Caithness

Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Thurso	1	0.5%	2,946	0.1%		
Wick	1	0.5%	7,548	0.2%		
Totals	2	1.0%	10,494	0.3%	25,656	0.5%

Orkney

Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Kirkwall	2	1.0%	3,517	0.1%		
Unidentified	2	1.0%	-	-		
Totals	4	2.0%	3,517	0.1%	22,077	0.5%

Shetland

Centre	No. of showings	% of all exhibitions	A Burgh Population	% Scottish Population	B County Population (inclusive of A)	% Scottish Population
Unidentified	2	1.0%	-	-	21,421	0.4%

* The population given for West Linton (Peebles) is the 1931 Census figure for the parish.
* The population given for Bishopton (Renfrew) is the 1951 Census figure for the district.

Table 20: Counties that had no identifiable exhibitions, 1940-46:

County	Population	% of Scottish Population
Bute	18,823	0.4%
Clackmannan	31,948	0.7%
East Lothian	47,338	1.0%
Kinross	7,454	0.2%
Kirkcudbright	30,341	0.6%
Moray	40,806	0.8%
Nairn	8,294	0.2%
Sutherland	16,101	0.3%
West Lothian	81,431	1.7%
Totals	263,713	5.8%

Table 21: Ratios of Exhibitions to Populations (major cities)

City	Ratio
Perth	1: 4,350
Kilmarnock	1: 6,250
Paisley	1: 9,600
Dundee	1: 11,000
Aberdeen	1: 14,000
Edinburgh	1: 27,400
Kirkcaldy	1: 43,900
Glasgow	1: 45,350

Table 22: Identifiable Schools used for Exhibitions, 1940-46

Year	Area	Schools
1940-41	North East	Inverurie High School; Mackie Academy, Stonehaven
1941-42	-	-
1942-43	Borders	Kelso High School
1943-44	Borders	Galashiels Academy; Dumfries Academy
1944-45	Borders, Fife, Angus, North East, West Highlands,	Dumfries Academy; Bell Baxter High School, Cupar; Moss Side Junior School, Cowdenbeath; Brechin High School; Gordon’s School, Huntly; Dingwall Academy
1945-46	Borders, East Central; Fife, Angus, Perthshire, North East, North Highlands	Hawick High School; Galashiels Academy; Falkirk Academy; Bell Baxter High School (2), Cupar; Brechin High School; Perth Junior High School; Mackie Academy, Stonehaven; Buckie High School; Keith Senior Primary School ⁸ ; Banff Academy; Banchory High School; Wick High School; Miller Academy, Thurso
Total	19 schools	25 showings

Table 23: Exhibitions shown in Scottish Schools, 1940-46

Year	Title	School
1940-41	Contemporary Scottish and French Paintings (SB)	Inverurie High School; Mackie Academy, Stonehaven;
1941-42	-	-
1942-43	Modern Paintings (BIAE)	Kelso High School
1943-44	Original Contemporary Prints (BIAE) 19 th Century Scottish Paintings (BIAE)	Galashiels Academy Dumfries Academy
1944-45	Design in Daily Life (N) (BIAE) Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection (SC) Contemporary Scottish Paintings (N) (SB) Ideas on Design in the Home (N) (BIAE) The London Group (N) (SC)	Gordon’s School, Huntly Bell Baxter High School, Cupar; Brechin High School Dingwall Academy Moss Side Junior High School, Cowdenbeath Dumfries Academy
1945-46	The London Group (SC)	Mackie Academy, Stonehaven; Brechin High School; Bell Baxter High School Falkirk Academy; Wick High School; Miller Academy, Thurso;
1945-46 (cont.)	Scottish Modern Art Association First Collection (SB) The Glasgow School (SC) Contemporary Scottish Paintings (SB) The Artist at Work (SB) (small version) Prints and Print Making (N) (BIAE)	Hawick High School; Perth Junior High School Banchory High School; Keith Senior Primary School; Buckie High School; Banff Academy; Galashiels Academy Bell Baxter High School, Cupar
Totals	12 exhibitions	25 showings
		19 different schools

Table 24: Identifiable Exhibitions of Reproductions, 1940-46

1939-40	Title	Sets	Centres/Venues/Showings
Feb.	Reproductions	1	“smaller towns...in Scotland” ⁹
Totals		1	1+

1940-41	Title	Sets	Centres/Venues/Showings
Feb.- March	Reproductions	1 (min.)	Coopers Ltd., Glasgow; Rosyth Dockyard; Rolls Royce Ltd., Hillington; Royal Ordnance Factory (Cardonald or Bishopton)
Sept.	Reproductions	1	Royal Ordnance Factory (Cardonald or Bishopton)
?	Reproductions	2+	Various centres in Midlothian.” ¹⁰
Totals		4+ ¹¹	7+

1941-42	Title	Sets	Centres/Venues/Showings
May-June	Reproductions	1+	Stonehaven; Youth Clubs in Aberdeen and Montrose
Jan.	Reproductions (Old Masters)	1	Kilsyth
Totals		2+	3+

1942-43	Title	Sets	Centres/Venues/Showings
Oct.	French Post-Impressionist and British Paintings	1	Galashiels
Nov.	Reproductions	1	Paisley Art Gallery
Totals		2 ¹²	2

1943-44	Title	Sets	Centres/Venues/Showings
May- March	Reproductions	3 (min.)	Bennett’s Art Salon, Ayr; Glasgow; Edinburgh; AA Group; Glasgow; a factory; Dundee Civil Defence Centre; Fraserburgh Civil Defence Centre; Army Unit; ATS Unit; WRNS canteen; Ministry of Labour hostel; Army Unit; ATS Unit; Barracks; Min. of Labour hostel; Naval canteen
Totals		3+	17

1944-45	Title	Sets	Centres/Venues/Showings
June-?	Reproductions	2 (min.)	Canteen, Glasgow; RAF Base; canteen, Glasgow; Army Study Centre; Glasgow; WRNS establishment; Army Units; West of Scotland; canteens; RAF Base; Dunfermline WRNS; Glasgow Area Army Education Corps.
Dec. - ?	Breughel Reproductions (CEMA)	1	Bilsland Bros., Glasgow; Glasgow; Rolls Royce Ltd., Hillington
Mar.-May	American Painting (CEMA)	1	“Factory tour”
Totals		4+	16+

1945-46	Title	Sets	Centres/Venues/Showings
April-Dec.	American Painting (CEMA)	1	Bilsland Bros., Glasgow; factory tour
May	What is Modern Painting? (MOMA, New York)	1	Buckie High School; Portsoy Junior Secondary School; Keith Grammar School; Banff Academy; Youth House, Edinburgh;
May	Reproductions (BIAE)	1 (min.)	Dumfries Army Study Centre; WRNS Centre, Oban; Resettlement Advice Bureau, Edinburgh; Resettlement Advice Centre, Glasgow; Perth Young Farmers’ Club; WRNS establishment; Kirkwall Art Club; Lintwhite Hostel, Bridge of Weir; No. 1 Army Formation College, Dalkeith (Newbattle Abbey);WRNS station

Dec.– Feb.	Accent on Colour (BIAE)	1	Army Study Centre, Edinburgh; Army Study Centre, Edinburgh (Scottish Command)
Dec.	Breughel Reproductions (CEMA)	1	Royal Ordnance Factory or YMCA Hostel, Bishopton;
Totals		5+	19+

Table 25: Schools that showed reproductions, 1940-46

Year	Exhibition	School
1941-42	Unknown	Mackie Academy, Stonehaven?
1945-46	What is Modern Art?	Buckie Academy; Portsoy Junior Secondary School; Keith Grammar School; Banff Academy
Total	2	5

Table 26: Total identifiable sets & showings of reproductions in Scotland, 1940-46

Total Sets	Total Showings
19+	65+

¹Williams once referred to this exhibition as being of reproductions (BIAE Executive Committee Minute Book, December (?) 1940, NIACE) but elsewhere the term ‘autographic prints’ is used. This implies artists’ prints, and hence I count it as a print exhibition.

²Two openings were held in Montrose, on 7 and 13 July, both performed by the Countess of Airlie. (*CEMA Bulletin* 15 (July 1941) confirmed by *Montrose Yearbook and Directory*, 1942).

³Reference to Lanark, Stirling, Greenock, Perth and Kilmarnock in Council paper LXXXII, 1941, NA ED 136/190. I exclude Kilmarnock because that was probably the *Modern Paintings* exhibition. Galashiels is referred to by Ellen Kemp (*The Scotsman*, 17 December 1941). It would seem that these centres received one or other of *Scottish Paintings*, *Modern Paintings* or *Living in Cities*.

⁴In December 1943 Fox reviewed bookings for an unidentified exhibition organised by Kemp. The data suggests it was this exhibition. She noted civilian showings in Troon and Inverness, and that five or more others were held in Army barracks etc. Over last nine months (she noted) Kemp’s civilian and service showings had been almost exactly equal (Fox to James, 17 December 1943, VA EL 3/92). I have therefore added Troon to the venues recorded for this exhibition. Overall Fox’s comments suggest that other centres and venues are absent from my data.

⁵The itinerary of this exhibition suggests that it consisted of reproductions, but Art Advisory Committee minutes of 16 November 1944 record that the works would be “dispersed” at the end of the tour. This would not have been said of reproductions. The count of seven CEMA exhibitions with 12 showings is confirmed by a statement giving those figures (James to Parker, 8 March 1944, NAS ED 61/28).

⁶The count assumes that the same transport workers’ canteen in Glasgow showed *Oriental Prints* and *19th Century Scottish Paintings*. Ellen Kemp recorded that this exhibition had been “promised to a large number of factory canteens, Women’s Land Army hostels etc.” (27 October 1944, NLS Dep. 355/538). I have found no trace of these venues and have not counted them in my data.

⁷Ellen Kemp circulated a list of exhibitions already held or about to be held from April to December 1945. The list is not extant, but showed an average of seven showings per month from Stranraer to Thurso and an increasing demand for guide lecturers. If this was sustained, around 84 showings would have taken place in 1945-46, almost double the number shown here. This figure must therefore have included reproductions, perhaps in the region of thirty showings. I have been able to identify a minimum of 19 showings of reproductions that year, and an additional ten would be not be implausible (Progress Report and Future Plans, Minutes of Art Advisory Committee, 19 November 1945, NLS Acc. 97/87/271).

⁸Referred to in CEMA records as “Keith new school hall”. This is probably a reference to Keith Senior Primary School (for years four to seven) which opened in September 1939.

⁹Referred to in a report to the Fifth Meeting of CEMA, February 1940. The set comprised 60 images, but no further information is given. It probably continued touring into 1940-41.

¹⁰In December (?) 1940 Williams recorded “small sets circulated...in Midlothian” (BIAE Executive Committee Minute Book, NIACE). CEMA’s Annual Report (1941-42) notes that “many” shows of reproductions were not listed in it.

¹¹In June 1940 three sets of reproductions were said to be “in preparation”.

¹²Tom Johnston’s reply to a question in Parliament (16 July 1942) stated that there had been five exhibitions of reproductions in Scotland to that date (NAS ED 61/27). That tallies closely to the figures given here for 1940-41 and 1941-42.

APPENDIX THREE: Scottish Finance, 1940-47

The basis on which the Scottish allocation, founded on the Goschen formula, was determined was stated in a Treasury memorandum of 1945. The sum was to be worked out firstly by deducting total UK costs from the Treasury grant, including salaries, administration and centrally-planned activities (the memo noted “this will always be a source of argument”). In year one, Scotland would then receive $11/91$ ths of the remainder. In year two, the Scottish allocation would be “diminished or increased (a) by $11/80$ ths of the amount by which expenditure in [England and Wales] in year 1 differed from the estimate on which the Scottish budget was calculated and (b) by the amount by which the Scottish Committee overspent or underspent in year 1”.¹

In Arts Council terms, 1945-46 was taken as ‘year 1’ even though the Goschen formula had been the guideline from 1940 onwards. However, the lack of consistent and definitive information about Scottish income and expenditure throughout the period of this study makes more than an informed guess impossible about how Scotland fared financially under CEMA and the first two years of the Arts Council. There are several reasons for this. The records themselves are patchy, not always clear about time periods and whether expenditure figures take income into account or not. It is not always clear when BIAE expenditure is included. Scotland also benefited from activities organised in London (e.g. factory concerts, exhibition-related costs, Old Vic and Pilgrim Players theatre tours, etc.) and its share of related costs is not distinguished in the financial records. *Hansard* gives the following figures:²

Year	Direct Exp. (Scotland)	Direct Exp. (E&W)
1941-42	£3,169	£36,120
1942-43	£5,843	£72,999
1943-44	£6,267	£87,554
1944-45	£12,881	£105,574

Despite their seeming clarity, it is not easy to interpret these figures, or to reconcile them with internal documents or even Annual Reports. On the face of it, Scotland received less than the Goschen proportion of English and Welsh expenditures between 1941 and 1944. This may be true, though several points make the figures uncertain. Assuming the procedure described above applied before 1946, a proportion of the difference between estimated and actual annual expenditure, and of any under-spend in Scotland would (if applicable) have been deducted from the Scottish allocation each year. Secondly, the Scottish share of centrally incurred programme costs (which (*Hansard* recorded “cannot be precisely apportioned”) may be included in the England and Wales figure, exaggerating the difference. The 1944-45 figure, on the other hand, is precisely on the Goschen share, so far as one can tell given the uncertain factors.

CEMA

Between January 1940 and March 1942 CEMA received a total of £132,500 from the Pilgrim Trust and the Treasury, in addition to which would have been box office and other income. A budget of November 1941 shows expenditure of £117,606 to that point, which is consistent with the above.³ If central administration costs were about £13,250 (10%) the remainder is £119,250 and a Goschen share £14,400. For the whole of this period I can identify approximately £10,700 spent in Scotland. Of the Treasury's £50,000, less an estimated £5,000 (10%) for central administration, Scotland should have received approximately £5,400 in 1940-41. Grants totalling £3,370 are identifiable, approximately £2,000 below a simple Goschen calculation. In September 1941, Parker argued that Scotland was not getting its Goschen share for music.⁴ Ivor Brown's enquiry of November 1941 into the lower level of activity in Scotland is also circumstantial evidence that a Goschen share may not have been achieved. However,

Glasgow provided figures for 1941-42 showing that CEMA spent approximately £58,000 on its programmes, of which Scotland received £7,300, slightly above the Goschen proportion.⁵ Had there been a substantial shortfall, the SED would certainly have raised the issue, and there is no evidence that it did. It seems likely, then, that lower spending in 1940-41 was balanced by higher in 1941-42, and that something acceptably close to the Goschen share was reached.

In 1942-43 CEMA received a Treasury grant of £100,000. Administration and related costs were £16,264, leaving £83,736. A Goschen formula split would have yielded Scotland £10,121. I can identify £8,664 in art expenditures. The shortfall of £1,457 could be accounted for by the deductions outlined above. In 1943-44 the Treasury grant was £115,000. The growth of regional administration raised central costs to £28,968, leaving £86,032. A Goschen formula split would have been about £10,400, but I can identify only £5,274 of the Scottish allocation. In 1944-45 the Treasury grant was £175,000 and central costs approximately £22,700 (probably an underestimate). A Goschen formula split of the remaining £152,200 would have been about £18,400. I can identify only £8,568 of Scottish art expenditures. These apparent shortfalls are so large that they would have been challenged by the SED and Scottish Committee, had they been actual. The absence of any complaint strongly suggests that the position was satisfactory and the flaw is in the data that I have. On balance, then, it seems likely that despite my information, Scotland did receive the proportion of funding it expected, after 1941-42.

The Arts Council

Annual Reports for 1945-46 and 1946-47 do not give separate statements of Scottish income and expenditure. In 1945-46 the total Treasury grant was £235,000. Deducting central administration costs of £28,200 (12%) leaves £206,800, of which a simple Goschen formula share (i.e. ignoring the refined calculation outlined at the start of this section, which is unverifiable) would have been £25,000. This suggests that the Scottish allocation should have been around £22,500, plus approximately £2,500 held back for central programme costs. However, I have not been able to verify this. In 1946-47 the Treasury grant was £350,000. Deducting central administration costs of £42,000 (12%) leaves £308,000. This suggests that a simple Goschen formula share would have been approximately £37,200; around £33,000 to the Scottish Committee and £4,000 for central programme costs. An internal document gives Scottish Committee expenditure for 1946-47 as £31,440 (visual art received £3,375, drama £13,183, music £9,450 and administration £5,432).⁶ This is very close to my estimation and the difference could easily be accounted for by the actual calculation made at the time.

My imperfect data, then, cannot confirm that Scotland received the Goschen formula share after 1945. However, the Treasury, Scottish Office and CEMA itself were all formally committed to applying the formula. I am not aware of any complaints about funding from the Scottish Committee or the SED around this time and believe that it is unlikely that Scottish funding was significantly below the Goschen level between 1945 and 1947.

Comparative Financial Values

The figures below are based on Office of National Statistics data (O’Donoghue, Goulding and Allen, 2003) in which 2003 is the most recent year.

Value of £1 compared to 2003 values:

1940	£35
1941	£32
1942	£30
1943	£29
1944	£28
1945	£27
1946	£26

Some 1940 figures compared to 2003 equivalents:

£50,000	£1,770,297
£25,000	£885,148
£14,000	£495,683
£12,000	£424,871
£7,000	£247,841
£6,000	£212,435
£1,000	£35,405
£500	£17,702
£250	£8,850

¹ Hale to Glasgow, Scottish Budget, 28 November 1945, VA EL 5/92.
² Written answers, 296 – Arts Council (Accounts), *Hansard*, 11 July 1946.
³ Council Paper CXI, CEMA Survey, 19 November 1941, VA EL 2/11.
⁴ Parker to Glasgow, 13 September 1941, NAS ED 61/27.
⁵ Glasgow to Parker, 29 July 1942, NAS ED 61/27. Glasgow called this “a rough estimate”.
⁶ Fox to Glasgow, 20 March 1947, VA EL 3/96.

APPENDIX FOUR: Selective Biographies

Ivor Brown (1891-1974). Author and journalist. Born Penang, Malaya; Aberdonian father. Educated Cheltenham College and Balliol College, Oxford. Conscientious Objector, 1914-18. Lectured for Oxford tutorial classes and wrote for *The New Age*. London drama critic and leader-writer, *The Manchester Guardian*, 1919-35. Lecturer, Art and the Theatre, Liverpool University, 1926-29. Professor of Drama, Royal Society of Literature, 1939. Played an important part in publishing Scottish Renaissance writers in London in the 1930s. Theatre critic, *The Observer*, 1929-54. Publicist, then Director of Drama, CEMA, 1940-42. Editor of *The Observer*, 1942-48. Associate Editor and Honorary Director, *The Observer*, 1948-54. Chairman, British Drama League, 1954-65.

Ernest Bullock (1890-1979). Composer. Knighted 1951. Born Wigan into a working class family. Educated Wigan Grammar School. Studied University of Durham, graduating with a BA in music, 1908; Doctor of Music, 1914. Served First World War, France, 1915-19. Gained an early reputation as a composer of church music, chamber music and songs. Sub-organist, Manchester Cathedral, 1912-15. Organist and Choirmaster, Exeter Cathedral, 1919-27. Organist and Master of Choristers, Westminster Abbey, 1928-41. Arranged music for 1937 Coronation (fanfares still used). Property and papers destroyed by a bomb, 1940. Gardiner Professor of Music, Glasgow University, and Director of the Royal Scottish Academy of Music, 1941-52. Director of the Royal College of Music, 1953-60. Member of the Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1943-50.

Hugh Adam Crawford (1898-1982) Painter. Born Busby, Lanarkshire. Educated Garelochhead Public School. Served in France, 1915-19. Studied Glasgow School of

Art, 1919-23; Central School of Arts and Crafts and St. Martin's School of Art, London, 1923-25. Runner-up, Prix de Rome, 1926. Lecturer, Glasgow School of Art, 1925; Head of Drawing and Painting Department, 1936-48. Principal, Gray's School of Art, Aberdeen, 1948-53. Principal, Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art and Design, Dundee, 1953-64.

Stanley Cursiter (1887-1976). Painter and lithographer. Born Kirkwall, Orkney. Educated Kirkwall School, Edinburgh College of Art and Royal College of Art. First solo exhibition, Orkney, 1910. Arranged Post-Impressionist exhibition for Society of Scottish Artists (SSA), 1913. Served First World War, France. Twice mentioned in Dispatches. Travelled in France. Returned to Scotland, 1920. President, SSA 1920. Exhibited RSA, SSA, RSW, RGI and RA, 1921-39. Keeper, National Galleries of Scotland, 1925-30; Director, 1930-48. Queen's Painter and Limner for Scotland, 1948-76. Secretary, Royal Fine Art Commission in Scotland; Secretary, Royal Scottish Academy; member, Scottish Committee of the Council for Art and Industry.

Ian Finlay (1906-?). Author, broadcaster and Museum Director. Born, Auckland, New Zealand; Scottish parents. Educated Edinburgh Academy and Edinburgh University. Joined Royal Scottish Museum, 1932. Keeper, Dept. of Art and Ethnography, 1955-61. Director, 1961-71. Professor of Antiquities to the RSA, 1971. Deputy Regional Officer for Scotland, Ministry of Information, 1942-44. Secretary, Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland, 1953-61. Edinburgh Festival Council, 1968-71. Honorary Academician, RSA. Freeman, City of London. Member, Scottish Committee of ACGB, 1947-57 and 1963-66. Vice-Chairman, Scottish Arts Council, 1967.

Mary A. Fox (Mrs. S. Shirley Fox). Dates and maiden name unknown. Administrator. Released by Department of Health for Scotland, 1942, to take up post as first Regional, then National, Organiser, Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1942-47; Director (1946-47). Returned as Deputy Director, 1949-51. Her husband was Stephen Shirley-Fox, a writer, possibly related to the painter and numismatist John Shirley-Fox (d. 1939).

Sir Hector Hetherington (1888–1965). Philosopher and University Administrator. Knighted, 1936. Born Cowdenbeath. Educated Dollar Academy. Studied Glasgow University (1905-07) and Oxford University. Lecturer, Moral Philosophy, Glasgow University, 1910-14. Taught Sheffield University 1914-15; Professor of Logic and Philosophy Cardiff, 1915-20. Principal, Royal Albert Memorial College, Exeter, 1920-24. Professor of Moral Philosophy, Glasgow University, 1924-27. Vice-Chancellor, Liverpool University, 1927-36. Principal, Glasgow University 1936-61. Carnegie UK Trustee from 1936; later a Life Trustee.

Dr. Thomas J. Honeyman (1891-1971). Art Gallery Director. Born Glasgow, son of an engine driver. Studied medicine at Glasgow University (contemporary of O.H. Mavor, Walter Elliot, Tom Johnston). Served First World War, France. Practised medicine before becoming an art dealer with Reid and Lefevre, London. Director, Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow, 1937-1954. Involved in establishing Scottish Tourist Board in later 1940s. Served on Scottish Advisory Committee of the British Council. Member, Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1943-46.

Dr. Archibald F. Hyslop (1893-1943). SED Inspector of Schools. Born Aberdeen. Educated Aberdeen Grammar School, 1897-1910. Graduated MA Honours (First Class) in classics, Aberdeen University, 1914. Commissioned, Gordon Highlanders; served in France, 1916-18. Assistant Education Officer, Third Army, 1918-19. Demobilized with rank of Captain. Aberdeen Grammar School, teaching English and Latin, 1921. Awarded fellowship to Aberdeen University. Taught Manchester Grammar School, 1925-28. Joined SED; Inspector of Schools, Western Division, 1928; Kincardine and Zetland District, 1932; Border District from 1938. SED music specialist. Member, Carnegie UK Trust Joint Committee of Music and Drama. Wrote musical comedy for BBC radio and Harry Gordon under pseudonyms including 'Rae Elrick', 'Steven Hive' and 'Forbes Hazelwood'. Became a significant collector of modern Scottish painting, initially advised by T. J. Honeyman.

Thomas Johnston (1882-1965). Politician. Born Kirkintilloch. Educated Lenzie Academy and Glasgow University. Contemporary of Walter Elliot, T. J. Honeyman and O. H. Mavor. Published *Forward*, 1906-36. Labour MP for Stirling, 1922-24; 1929-31; 1935-45. Scottish Regional Commissioner for Civil Defence, 1939-41. Secretary of State for Scotland, 1941-45. Established North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board, 1945; and Chairman, 1945-59. Chairman of the Forestry Commission in Scotland, and Scottish Tourist Board. Governor of the BBC.

Charles Kemp (1906-?). Adult Education lecturer. Born Aberdeen; Father a baker. Worked as a house painter in Edinburgh. Studied at Ruskin College, Oxford (late 1920s) and Wadham College, Oxford University, 1930-32; graduated BA, Class II degree in Politics, Philosophy and Economics. Worked in an educational settlement in

South Wales. Joined Edinburgh University Settlement at Kirk o Field, working with Grace Drysdale. Trustee, York Trust, 1934. Appointed lecturer in politics and economics, Newbattle Abbey College, 1937. Married Ellen M. Willison. Active in the WEA. Honorary Secretary, Scottish Branch, BIAE, 1938-41. BIAE exhibitions organiser in Scotland (part-time, with Ellen Kemp) 1940-41. Army Education Corps, 1941-45 (North Africa and Italy). Returned to Scotland ; Secretary, Scottish Branch, BIAE, 1946-48. 'Senior Tutor in Adult Education', Oxford (details unknown), 1948-.

Eric Linklater (1899-1974). Novelist. Born Penarth, Wales; Orcadian father. Attended Aberdeen Grammar School (where he met Hyslop). Served First World War, France, 1914-18 (wounded 1918). Studied Aberdeen University, 1918-25. Assistant Editor, The Times of India, Bombay, 1925-27. Lecturer, Aberdeen University, 1927-28. Commonwealth Fellow at Cornell and Berkeley Universities, USA, 1928-30. SNP candidate for East Fife, 1933. Married 1933. Moved to Italy, then settled in Orkney. Commanded a company of Royal engineers in Orkney, 1939-40; then joined the War Office writing pamphlets. Served in Italy, 1944-45. Elected Rector of Aberdeen University, 1945. Left Orkney in 1947. Member of the Scottish Committee of ACGB, 1947-49.

Hugh Pattison MacMillan, Lord MacMillan (1873-1952). Life Peerage, 1930. Judge. Born Glasgow; advocate 1897; took silk 1912; 'one of the busiest seniors at the Scottish bar'. Assistant Director of Intelligence, Department of Information, 1918. Appointed Lord Advocate by Ramsay MacDonald, 1924. Set up practice in London. Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, 1930. President of the Scottish Texts Society; helped found the Stair Society (1934) and the National Library of Scotland (1935). Minister for

Information, 1939-40. Returned to House of Lords 1941; resigned 1947. Perhaps best known for chairmanship of the Treasury Committee on Finance and Industry (1929-31). Its report became known by his name although mainly written by Keynes. Chairman and Trustee, Pilgrim Trust, 1930-47. Trustee, Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland. Chairman, Committee on the Preservation of Works of Art in Enemy Hands, 1944-47.

Sir John H. F. McEwen (1894-1961) Baronet of Marchmont. Politician. Educated Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge. Served Cameron Highlanders, France, 1914-18 (Capt. 1915). Prisoner of War. Entered Diplomatic Service, 1921; Second Secretary, 1925-27. National Liberal MP, Berwickshire and Haddington, 1931. PPS to Secretary of State for India (R.A. Butler), 1932-36, and Secretary of state for Scotland (Walter Elliot), 1936-38. Party Whip and Under-Secretary for Scotland, 1939-40. Lord Commissioner of the Treasury, 1942-44. Artistic interests: music, literature and Scottish painting. Published *Poems* (1920, and others in various reviews) and a radio play (broadcast in 1951). Appointed Trustee of the National Galleries of Scotland, 1952. Chairman, Scottish Advisory Panel of the British Council, 1953-57. Member, Scottish Committee of ACGB, 1952-61 (Chairman, 1958-61).

Sir William Wallace McKechnie (1872-1947). Knighted 1935. Educationalist and administrator. Born Edinburgh; educated Daniel Stewart's College, Edinburgh University (1895) and Trinity College, Oxford (1896-98) and in France. Assistant to the Professor of Greek, Edinburgh University, 1898-99. Lecturer in Humanity, Glasgow University, 1899-1901. Edited Baudelaire's *Scarabée d'Or*. Joined SED; Inspector of Schools, 1901-03. HMI, 1903-22. Assistant Second Secretary, 1922-27. Second

Secretary, 1927-29; Secretary, 1929-36. Member, Scottish Committee, Council for Art and Industry, 1934-35. Member, Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1943-46.

William MacTaggart (1903-1981). Knighted 1962. Painter. Born Loanhead, nr. Edinburgh. Educated privately. Studied Edinburgh College of Art, 1918-21, then France and Italy. Exhibited RSA from 1921. Founder member of the 1922 Group. President of the Society of Scottish Artists, 1933. Elected Associate, RSA, 1937, and RSA, 1948. Secretary, RSA, 1955, President, RSA, 1959-69. Honorary RA, 1959; RA, 1968. Trustee of the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland, 1960. Scottish Committee of ACGB, 1953-62

Dr. Osborne Henry Mavor (1888-1951). 'James Bridie', playwright. Born Glasgow, son of Harry Mavor, founder of Mavor and Coulson Ltd. (engineers). Nephew of James Mavor, economist and associate of Patrick Geddes. Educated Glasgow Academy. Studied medicine, Glasgow University. Contemporary of Walter Elliott, T. J. Honeyman and Tom Johnston. Gained theatre experience at Alfred Wareing's Glasgow Repertory Theatre (founded 1909). Served RAMC, France and Middle East, 1914-19 (attained rank of Major). Mentioned in Dispatches. Practised medicine, Glasgow from 1919. Began writing seriously in the 1920s. First major success was *The Anatomist* (1930), followed by *A Sleeping Clergyman* (1933) and *Susannah and the Elders* (1937). Served RAMC, 1940-42. Resumed writing career with *Holy Isle* (1942) and *Mr. Bolfry* (admired by Shaw) in 1943. Founder of Glasgow Citizens' Theatre, 1943. Council member, British Drama League; Director, Scottish National Theatre Society; Chairman, Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1942-46; continued as member, 1946-51.

John William Parker (1885–1961). Administrator. Joined Scotch Education Department, London, 1904 (Second Division Clerk); Staff Clerk, 1919; Principal Staff Officer, 1920; Junior Assistant Secretary, 1929; Assistant Secretary, 1936; Second Secretary (Acting), 1939; Second Secretary, 1940-46; Deputy Secretary, 1946-48. Retired December 1948. SED Assessor on CEMA and the Arts Council, 1940-48.

Dr. John R. Peddie (1887-1979). Administrator. Educated Grangemouth High School. Studied English, Glasgow University; graduated 1909. Lecturer in English, Glasgow University, 1911-19. Glasgow University Officers' Training Corps, 1916-19. Adviser of Studies, Glasgow University, 1919-25. Executive Officer, National Council for the Training of Teachers in Scotland, 1925-41. Member, BBC Adult Education Committee (late 1920s). Founder-member, Scottish Branch, BIAE (1928) and Hon. Secretary (to 1938). Secretary, Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland, 1941-57. Governor, Heriot Watt University, 1957-68. Trustee, National Library of Scotland, 1942-73. Vice-President and Trustee, SSA. Member, Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1943-50, and 1952-54.

Sir George Pirie (1863-1946). Knighted 1937. Painter. Born Campbeltown (father a doctor). Educated Glasgow Academy and Glasgow University. Studied art in Paris. Exhibited: RSA from 1887; RA from 1888. Elected ARSA, 1913. Served RAMC, France, 1915-19. President, RSA, 1933-44. Member of the Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1943-45.

Eva, Countess of Rosebery (1892-1987). Lady Belper; Daughter of Lord Aberdare. Married 1924, Sixth Earl of Rosebery (National Liberal MP and Secretary of State for

Scotland, 1945). Trustee, Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland. Like her husband, a horse-racing enthusiast. Artistic interests predominantly in music. Member, Scottish Committee of ACGB Music Sub-Committee, 1945-49; and Scottish Committee, 1947-49.

Neil Shaw (1881-?). Gaelic scholar and Bard. Born Duntroon, Argyllshire. Educated Ardlussa Public School, Jura. Married 1935. General Secretary, An Comunn Gaidhleach, 1913-. President, Glasgow Jura Association, 1929-34. Bard, Bute Branch of An Comunn Gaedhleach, 1906-. Served First World War, 1916-19. Author of Gaelic poems and essays; first prize winner, Mods, 1909-12 (literary and oral competitions). Recreations: piping and bowls. Member, Scottish Committee of CEMA and ACGB, 1943-49.

David Macbeth Sutherland (1883-1973). Hon. LLD, Aberdeen (1953). Painter. Born Wick, educated Pultneytown Academy. Studied art at The Royal Institution, Edinburgh College of Art and the Life Class of the Royal Scottish Academy. Carnegie Travelling Scholarship (Paris and Madrid). Lecturer, Edinburgh College of Art. Served in Royal Scots (Capt.), France, First World War. RSA, 1936 (ARSA, 1923). Principal, Gray's School of Art, Aberdeen, 1936-48.

Adam Bruce Thomson (1885-1976) Painter and printmaker. OBE, 1963. Served in Royal Engineers, France, First World War. Lecturer, Edinburgh College of Art 1925 (taught etching). President, SSA, 1937. RSA 1946 (ARSA, 1937); RSW, 1947; President, RSW, 1956-63; HRSW, 1968.

John Mackay Thomson (1887-1974). Knighted, 1946. Educationalist and administrator. Born, Dunning, Perthshire. Father a minister. Educated Glenalmond School, Studied classics, Edinburgh University, 1908; Oriel College, Oxford (graduated 1913). Assistant to Professor of Humanity, Edinburgh University, 1913-14. Sixth Form Master, Fettes College, Edinburgh, 1915-20. Rector, Aberdeen Grammar School, 1920-21. SED Inspector of Schools, 1921-24; Junior Assistant Secretary, 1925-35; Senior Assistant Secretary, 1935-36. Second Secretary, 1936-1939; Acting Secretary, 1939-40; Secretary, 1940-52. SED Adult Education Advisory Committee (1931-). Scottish Committee of the Council for Art and Industry, 1937-39.

James Welsh (1881-1969). Hon. LLD Politician and businessman. Born into a working-class family in Paisley, educated Bridgeton board school. Left school at 11. Entered Templeton's factory, 1894, using the company's library to continue his education. He attended evening classes, studying history and economics. Interests in the arts, especially music. Became insurance salesman. By 1900 already involved in socialist politics. Married 1910 (wife died 1945). Entered the cinema business with George Smith in 1909, building up a chain of cinemas in and around Glasgow, which he ran until his retirement in 1950. President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors' Society (chairman of its Scottish Branch). Elected Glasgow Corporation, 1913. Convener, Parks Committee and Convener, Art Gallery Sub-committee (1920s). Labour MP for Paisley, 1929-31. Prominent in steering the British Film Institute bill through Parliament. Returned to Glasgow politics, 1932; after formation of Macdonald's National Government, joined the Scottish Socialist Party. Became Chairman of the Scottish Housing Advisory Committee, a member of the Scottish Council for Art and Industry and the Central Consultative Committee on Transport. Governor of the Scottish Film

Council, 1934-67 and SFT's Joint Committee on Industry (1930s). Lord Provost of Glasgow, 1943-45. Carnegie UK Trustee, 1943-45. Member, Scottish Advisory Committee of the British Council. Chairman, Scottish Committee of ACGB, 1946-50.

James Wilkie (1896-1988). Administrator. Born Manchester of Scottish parents (always regarded himself as a Scot). Served France, 1914-18. Wounded; twice mentioned in dispatches. Awarded Order of the Crown of Rumania. Studied Oxford University, 1919-21. Board of Education, 1921-39. Spent some time (1920s) in Geneva with the League of Nations; drove trains as a strike-breaker in 1926. Seconded to the Empire Marketing Board for six years. Secretary, Carnegie UK Trust, 1939-54. Served as fire-watcher and Home Guard during Second World War. President of the Library Association, 1951. Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. In 1954 moved to Sussex and "became a campanologist, the scourge of recalcitrant vicars and would-be land developers...developed a remarkable skill in dowsing...sexing unborn babies and unearthing lost jewellery". Runner-up in Brain of Britain contest, 1956. (From obituary by Margaret Ovens, provided by Carnegie UK Trust).

Ellen M. Willison (1910-1961). Exhibitions Organiser. Born into a farming family. Educated St. George's School, Edinburgh. Studied Edinburgh College of Art, 1929-1933 (Diploma in Drawing and Painting). Completed a combined teacher training course under Edinburgh College of Art and the Edinburgh Provincial Training Committee, June 1934 ('very promising'). Married Charles Kemp. Joint Honorary Secretary of the Scottish Branch of the BIAE (with Charles Kemp), 1938-41; and Honorary Secretary, 1941-48. Assisted Charles Kemp organising BIAE Scottish exhibitions, 1940-41. BIAE part-time exhibitions organiser in Scotland from 1941, and

CEMA part-time Exhibitions Officer in Scotland 1944-46. Continued full-time for Scottish Committee of ACGB until her death in 1961.

Henry Harvey Wood. (Dates unknown.) Author and administrator. Studied Edinburgh College of Art, contemporary with William MacTaggart. Taught English, Edinburgh University. Joined British Council in 1939 to run Allied Centres in Scotland. Director, British Council in Paris and Edinburgh. Worked on the founding of the Edinburgh Festival 1945-47 and chaired its Programme Committee for some years. Retired 1965 as Director in Rome. Moved to Edinburgh. Author of *Two Scots Chaucerians* (Robert Henryson and William Dunbar) and monograph on William MacTaggart (junior).

APPENDIX FIVE: Idealism and Citizenship: CEMA and Scottish Thought

CEMA as it emerged in 1939-40 was not alien to Scotland or to Scottish social thought. Rather, there was a powerful Scottish contribution to Idealist social ethics in which, in the conjunction of social voluntarism and adult education, CEMA had its origin. It is not my argument that these Scottish currents had a determining role. I seek to show that they were contemporary and connected with similar and related currents in England and Wales. I do not attempt to do justice to the history of the philanthropic, charitable and philosophical motivations that also fed demands for social reform, nor do I deal with actual political programmes. My justification for the central position that I give to Idealism lies in the success of its moderate, optimistic social theory, which was founded on consensus and compromise, in penetrating government policymaking, adult education, social voluntarism and popular practice. Idealist theory functioned at all levels to promote its ideals of corporatism and class reconciliation.

If there is a dominant theme in this section it is that of the place of citizenship in an age of emerging social democracy. For men like Tom Jones democracy was an incomplete project, vulnerable to attack from left and right, by no means certain that it commanded any significant future. The importance of education for citizenship to Jones, Hetherington and Tom Johnston was that each saw it as the foundation and defence of democratic values. Their passion for the teaching of citizenship was inspired by Henry Jones, William Smart and (behind them) Edward Caird and T. H. Green. These men were democrats, but all were deeply indebted to the anti-democrats Ruskin and Carlyle, the two most influential prophets of moral and social reform of their time. William Morris, whose Marxism distanced him from the liberal Idealists, is a minor figure here except in so far as his paradigm of creative work as unalienated labour was admired by

several of the Idealists (including Tom Jones). But this idea Morris derived primarily from Ruskin and Carlyle, not Marx.

I touch on Scottish contributions to theories of civil society, which influenced Hegel's conception of the state and its ameliorative role in respect of social inequalities and then returned to British thinking as part of his systematic philosophy. But in keeping with my purpose, I connect the citizenship debate of the later Idealists to Carlyle's horror of social atomisation and injustice, about which he wrote powerfully in *Signs of the Times* and later. This theme, which Carlyle inherited from Ferguson, Smith and Stewart, and his elevation of Work and social commitment (a deeply Scottish theme) were refined and given an economic context by Ruskin, his self-avowed disciple. The duty of the state to counteract through education the effects of division of labour on workers can be traced to the same Scottish Enlightenment figures. That society had a corporate meaning and destiny is an amalgam, in Carlyle, of the Calvinist spiritual commonwealth plus Schiller's poetic vision of man's spiritual progress and the Scottish Enlightenment concept of dynamic historical change.

Carlyle's importance as a source of German Romantic and Idealist influence is well known, but I draw on recent work that has re-stated the foundations of his thought in the Scottish philosophy of Common Sense. His refusal to dissolve matter into mind derives from Calvinism and Common Sense, and is matched by the majority of Idealists whose positions were also ultimately dualistic, including Green and Caird. I therefore do not use the label 'neo-Hegelian' for the British Idealists. The legacy of Common Sense and Calvinism in Carlyle's thought is most relevant to my purpose in his relentless insistence that social improvement depends on the moral transformation of the

individual. Only when the innate bonds of justice are recognised and acted on can reform of material relations begin. Ruskin too embraced this position, and it was to be a commonplace among Idealists including Green, Smart and Tom Jones, whose dictum ‘Action!’ could well have been Carlyle’s own.

I conclude by showing how later thinkers of the Scottish Idealist tradition projected its values into British society in the inter-war years, contributing to its pervasive presence as described by Harris (1999) and finally discuss the foundations of Tom Jones’s belief in the value of aesthetic education. This final part connects more or less directly with the report, *Training for Citizenship* (1943) discussed in Volume One, Part Two. In that report CEMA is understood as contributing, through aesthetic training, to the full education of citizens adequate to the demands of modern democracy. Bound to the corporate state not merely as an administrative mechanism, CEMA reflected the organic interconnection of the individual and the collectivity, as realised through the educational and voluntary agencies of cultural life.

Professional Society, Philanthropy and Idealism

Idealism helped to constitute the corporate, professional ethos of modern social democracy to which CEMA belonged. I therefore begin with Harold Perkin’s account of the triumph of the ‘professional ideal’ in modern British society. The social conditions that enabled CEMA to emerge are bound up with what Perkin has called the emergence of professional society, the term he gives to British society in the period after 1880 in which the professional classes rose to political dominance. Perkin (1989) brings together several themes pertinent to the creation of CEMA including the ethic of voluntary service and the growth of corporatism. The advocates of professional society

claimed a moral foundation that was both philosophically grounded and sanctioned by religion. The ideal was of “an elitist society run by professionals”.¹ It was ameliorative and interventionist, and professionals themselves were its necessary servitors. In political terms the professional ideal required for the security of its beneficiaries that they demonstrate in practice an ethic of public service. But there was a moral dimension too, grounded in charity and traditional philanthropy. Checkland (1980) describes the social bond philosophy of early 19th century charity, best exemplified by the work of Thomas Chalmers in the east-end of Glasgow. Personal service by the privileged classes for the urban poor, and self-help by the poor themselves, would forge society’s mutual bonds.² The evangelicals’ emphasis on the conscience of the relatively privileged was to echo in the attitudes of Carlyle, Ruskin and Green. Perkin traces the beginnings of the professional ideal to Malthus, ‘Christopher North’, Coleridge, Southey, Scott and Disraeli, all of whom (he writes) “revived the moribund aristocratic ideal of paternalism and the social responsibility of property”.³ Carlyle may be added to these. The moral case against idle wealth he derives from Adam Smith and James Mill. Perkin’s inclusion of John Wilson (‘Christopher North’), Scott, Smith and Mill is evidence of the strength of Scottish thought in the intellectual foundations of professional society. Ferguson might be included for his argument for active citizenship, in *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767).

The growth of civil society created an arena in which larger numbers of individuals engaged with a sense of the public consequence of their actions. Traditional civic humanist virtues of public duty and self-sacrifice were appropriated for the new culture of voluntary association. As Becker puts it:

The principle of voluntary association (voluntarism) thus came to the fore and was championed with exceptional fervour. In an increasingly urbanized world, traditional structures (conceived for and in predominantly agricultural societies) were either absent or inappropriate, and it was here that this voluntarism found expression in a wealth of new institutional forms. Patriotic societies, reading clubs, masonic lodges, academies of science and the fine arts are but a sample of the numerous manifestations of these practical social initiatives... The separation of society and the state enhanced and fortified that public space aptly termed “civil society”.⁴

The elevation of voluntarism in public discourse in the 18th and 19th centuries, though it had roots in traditional civic humanism, reflected a fear that the reciprocal relationships between people on which society depended were fraying in the conditions of modern life. That society exists at all is because it is composed of interdependent actors; as Hegel expressed it “We play into each others’ hands and so hang together”.⁵ Voluntary association as the foundation and moral bond of civil life can be traced from early theorists of civil society such as Pierre Nicole, into concepts of active citizenship in Smith, Ferguson and Carlyle, to the later British Idealists.⁶ Hegel was indebted to Scottish thought on the nature of history and society.⁷ However, he subordinated civil society to the state (which the Scots had not done) as the embodiment of a higher principle of unity. The theory of reciprocity extended to the state’s responsibility to maintain the conditions in which a free citizenry in the new mercantile society could flourish. The state was not merely an external coercive power as Hobbes had conceived it but was bound to its polity by obligations both political and moral. Smith, though having little faith in political authority given the evidence of the moral frailty of power,

feared the ultimate disadvantage of the free citizen if social advancement led to domination by the state.⁸ Nevertheless he argued that the sphere within which the state could exercise its authority could not be prescribed in principle. Smith and Ferguson, for example, argued that popular education should be undertaken by the state not merely for economic reasons but for moral reasons, to counteract the intellectual and spiritual damage caused by the industrial division of labour. Kames, Dunbar and Millar agreed, Millar arguing that the education of the lower orders was in the interests of the higher.⁹

In criticising the destructive effects of the division of labour (which Becker calls the dominant issue for the Scots) Smith and Ferguson provided those who advocated the professionalisation of society with moral justification for state provision of popular education. Carlyle, arguing for an Education Bill in 1843, echoed Smith and Ferguson in his description of the uneducated as “the atoms of...Chaos”.¹⁰ For Hegel, despite the danger that a dominant state might destroy the progressive dialectic between itself and the civil sphere, there was an undeniable case for state intervention to resolve the conflicts that arise from competing interests, but its role at best was ameliorative in respect of inequalities.¹¹ The Romantic movement also contributed to a re-figuring of the state-society relationship. Through Rousseau’s idea of the ‘general will’ and the trend to conceive of society as an organism, the state could even be regarded as an expression of society, and hence unified (in some essential sense) with it. As industrial society developed, the failure of the market to provide adequately without state intervention became inescapable. So began the earliest state welfare programmes, focused on public health, setting in train the elaboration of government and quasi-government, which, in many respects, marks the success of Perkin’s professional ideal.

The belief that conflicting interests of wealth and class may be reconciled by achieving a higher moral perspective (the moderation of self-interest and the recognition of mutual dependence, not by the abolition of class itself) was fundamental to emerging social democracy. Mutual dependence was not a mere instrumentality of professional society but belonged to its essence, being a tenet of the philosophical Idealism on which it drew heavily. Harris, writing about the pervasive influence of Idealism on social thinking up to the Second World War, draws attention to several of its characteristics: its emphasis on the corporate identity of society as an organism, on individual altruism and on active citizenship. She calls Idealist social theory an adjustment to democracy, but one could as well call it a response to the social atomisation of modernity: "It was designed to provide a model that would help to re-integrate the fragmented consciousness of modern man into cohesive corporate communities".¹²

Idealism provided a theoretical and moral framework for political and social action, including that of the state in claiming to act for all rather than for sectional interests. Its intersection with the professional ideal is evident. Idealism's constant theme of the unity of the individual and society enabled Tom Jones to describe the 1890s as "the period of Victorian Christian Liberalism [when] the Liberal creed and the prevailing Protestant theology were in fundamental accord".¹³ In *Welsh Broth* he expressed the high excitement that his encounter with the philosophy of Henry Jones and the Caird brothers, Edward and John, instilled in him and concluded:

The kinship with Socialism of aspects of Hegelian thought made it more palatable to some of us. The State was a divine idea and a moral agent, but we did not envisage it as totalitarian nor sacrifice the individual to it. Both grew

together. “The best State,” said Henry Jones, “is that which does most for the individual and enables him to do most for himself.” We knew our Carlyle but the Hero as Hitler was beyond our ken.¹⁴

By the early 20th century, Idealism’s organic conception of society and its spiritual teleology had mingled with social evolutionism and with psychological theories of collective consciousness. The latter owed something to Rousseau and romanticism, while the former had effectively re-conceptualised, in biologicistic terms, Scottish Enlightenment theories of stadial social development. Harris points out that even Alfred Marshall (Keynes’s teacher) whom she calls a “hard-nosed Cambridge realist” sympathised with the Idealist evolutionary model, his ‘moral economics’ of the 1890s treating the welfare of real people as the aim of economic theory.¹⁵ One might add that this was true also of Ruskin’s economics and of Marshall’s contemporary in Glasgow, William Smart. Sociology too was dominated by evolutionism, evidenced in the work of Patrick Geddes whose thought also drew on Classical Greek Idealism.¹⁶ Harris finds the trace of Idealism in the Sociological Society, in its journal *The Sociological Review* and in *The Social Service Review*, the journal of the NCSS.¹⁷ And she argues that education was also pervaded by Idealism. *The 1919 Report*, for example, is in many respects an Idealist document.

The success of Idealism in the universities, Harris argues, enabled it to achieve a position of cultural hegemony such that between the wars it reached its greatest diffusion in society, even as its academic star began to fall. The Victorian and Edwardian worlds in which it had been formed had disintegrated and optimism about human nature and destiny exposed as hollow by the First World War and its aftermath. Yet its values were tenacious. For Idealism’s non-philosophical heirs in the disturbed inter-war decades, those values joined

the individual and the community in a common purpose that gave meaning to life. Its social values in action were altruism, self-improvement through education, class reconciliation and constitutional evolutionism, resting on the reciprocal obligations of the individual and the state. Individual choices and actions mattered in that through them the moral nature of society would be progressively realised. Such values could be supported without Idealist metaphysics. To an extent Idealist social theory, which had risen out of the Christian ethic of charity and individual responsibility within an ultimately spiritual order had folded back into that older ethical tradition, losing distinctiveness and merging with the common body of Christian belief. Tom Jones himself gives evidence of this in his memoirs, describing his own journey from enthusiastic Idealist to his return to scripture as the most satisfying of all accounts of human purpose on earth.¹⁸

Idealism in Britain

Idealism in England had been encouraged by the revival of interest in classical Greece in the 1820s and 1830s, stimulated among others by F. D. Maurice, the Hare brothers and Thomas Arnold. Benjamin Jowett, Professor of Greek and later Master of Balliol, played an often-overlooked part in the turn towards Idealism.¹⁹ According to Faber (1957) it was from Jowett that Green and Caird “learned their Hegelian alphabet”.²⁰ The common description of the British Idealists as ‘neo-Hegelians’ however is misleading in that it privileges monism and obscures the dualistic form that was more common among the British Idealists, particularly in Scotland.²¹ Green, who maintained a distinction between nature and spirit, was a dualist, while Caird in the 1880s made an accommodation with the dualism of Common Sense.²² Other Scots Idealists, including A. D. Lindsay, Hector Hetherington and Alexander MacBeath all rejected monism. Idealist social theory in Britain had a relatively consistent core whatever the positions of

individual philosophers on the subject-object relationship. Each individual stands in relation to the totality of other minds, not to be conceived of in isolation or full independence from them. In consequence, the spiritual dialectic of Progress depends upon the self-realisation of individuals contributing to the moral good of the whole. As a group the Idealists found common ground in an elevated conception of the state as the guarantor of the society in which the individual could achieve their moral potential. As the progress of the whole was founded upon individual moral self-development, and as the state was taken to be the expression of the general will of society, its primary duty lay in the removal or at least amelioration of obstacles to individual self-development.

The idea of the general will underpinned British Idealist views of the relationship between the individual and the state, Bosanquet (1916) for example asserting that even state-imposed constraints enable the individual to obey his 'real will'. Others like Muirhead and Hetherington (1918) attempted to psychologise the concept to give it scientific plausibility. The concept of the general will, however, was to cause serious difficulties for Idealist thinkers and ultimately to contribute to its philosophical decline. Copleston (1975) notes of Bosanquet that, while he accepted that there was a place for the universal concept of humanity he and other Idealists fell back on the notion of the national community as the organism of whose general will the state was the expression.²³ Behind them stood Fichte, who had merged Rousseau's concept with Herder's idea of the 'national soul', the mysterious force that binds the cultural group together as a single entity. Each national soul was unique as Herder conceived it, expressed in all the forms of its collective life as revealed by history, an idea that Ergang (1976) says was decisively influential on Hegel.²⁴ The danger of this conception of the relationship between individual and state is apparent in retrospect. The organic

community, spiritual though it is, has to be a cohesive and therefore a limited entity, and thus Idealism's purported universalism provides a vehicle for nationalism, founded on irreducible national cultural identities. Idealism tended to naturalise national cultural identity as an aspect of the essence of reality. The question of what, precisely, a national community was, was nowhere more ambiguous than in Britain, as the example of Christian Socialism shows.²⁵ Hayes (1968) describes Christian Socialism as a late and intensely patriotic example of traditional (anti-modern) nationalism, critical on the one hand of economic liberalism and on the other of democracy.²⁶ This, however, misses its Romantic roots. God and history, for Maurice and Kingsley, had singled England out as the leading Christian nation.²⁷ Where Scotland stood in relation to this ideology was uncertain. The Christian Socialist ideal of brotherhood and family offered an example of social unity in embryo that impressed Green, and the educational work that the Christian Socialists undertook was seminal to the founder of the WEA, Albert Mansbridge. Kelly (1992) attributes the University Extension and Settlement movements to their example too. Despite its dubious ideological construction of 'brotherhood', Christian Socialism is the primary source of Mansbridge's faith in education as a means to overcome class divisions, and was tributary to the broader current of corporatist, social democratic liberalism.

Idealism in Scotland

Idealism began the climb towards its zenith in Scotland when Edward Caird returned from Balliol in 1866 to take up the chair of moral philosophy at Glasgow, but it had already penetrated the Scottish universities. In the 1820s Coleridge's philosophy was becoming familiar and the German Romantics were beginning to be known. Sir William Hamilton worked to keep these currents at bay, as Davie describes in *The Democratic*

Intellect (1961), but by the end of the 1830s “Germano-Coleridgeanism” was making some headway, particularly through the philosophical work of Maurice.²⁸ The first significant sympathiser with Idealism in the Scottish universities was, like Jowett, a classicist, John Stuart Blackie, appointed Professor of Greek at Edinburgh University in 1851. Davie calls him “the apostle of German romanticism”.²⁹ His interest in Gaelic culture earns him Ian Finlay’s tribute, “one of the earliest of hearty nationalists”.³⁰ Idealism had a native source in the work of J. F. Ferrier, but his system had little influence.³¹ According to Cunningham, James Hutchison Stirling’s *The Secret of Hegel* (1865) was very influential, and Davie describes him as the father of British Hegelianism.³² Idealism, then, was in the Scottish universities in native and German-inspired variations before the influence of Green and Caird was felt. Neither Ferrier nor Hutchison Stirling developed a social philosophy, but the ideas that Caird brought from Oxford was by no means foreign to the Scottish tradition, being deeply indebted to Thomas Carlyle. Carlyle is one of the main conduits by which German Idealist and Romantic thought penetrated philosophical, artistic and social thinking in Britain. The passion of his rhetoric made him exceptional, the most directly inspirational voice for two generations of social reformers after him, among them Ruskin, Morris, Green, Caird, Smart and Geddes; and indeed still with an impact on the generation of Tom Jones. He is like a great refracting glass, gathering rays from all directions, condensing them, and emitting them again charged with the fullness of his own personality, passions and fears, as often cloudy as clear. Carlyle demonstrates the strength of the Scottish contribution to the cause of social reform in the 19th century, and shows how that influence penetrated the social theory of British Idealism.

Carlyle himself was indebted to Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Schiller, to the idiosyncratic novelist and aesthetic theorist Friedrich Richter ('Jean Paul') and especially Goethe.³³ The German sources of Carlyle's thought were as much literary as philosophical, as befits someone who was himself less a logical, consistent thinker than a critical writer for whom imagination was superior to intellect. His reaction to the Germans was linked to his attitude towards Coleridge, to whose person and philosophy he expressed vehement antipathy, dismissing as "hocus pocus" Coleridge's elaborate metaphysical web-spinning.³⁴ Against the German-Romantic version of Carlyle, scholars in recent years have argued for the Scottish dimension of his thinking (which his contemporaries and Davie were able to take for granted), demonstrating its origins in his Annandale boyhood and its affinities with the Common Sense school. Carlyle's Edinburgh University tutors Dugald Stewart and Thomas Brown were both exponents of Common Sense, as was Hamilton, his friend from the 1820s. Never inclined to over-estimate the power of human intellect, Carlyle nonetheless found the Scottish school overly intellectual, negligent of feeling and inadequate to counter Humean scepticism.³⁵ He described Reid and his followers as realising that something had gone wrong in philosophy but not knowing how to put it right.³⁶ It was this frame of mind which opened him to the influence of the Germans, whom he discovered in 1819. Despite this, the very core of Carlyle's thought remained in the tradition of Common Sense dualism, as demonstrated by Jessop (1997) and others.³⁷

By the time of writing *Signs of the Times* in 1829 Carlyle was expressing revulsion with the gamut of scepticism, evangelicism, utilitarianism and materialist determinism.³⁸ Campbell (1976) reads *Signs of the Times* as seeking a balance between scepticism and faith, through a dualistic argument that is, despite his criticisms, indebted to Reid. Even

more apparent in the essay is Carlyle's rage against the 'Mechanical Age' and the social atomisation it had brought, echoing the fears of Smith and Ferguson. But to Carlyle it was futile to look to the reconstruction of government to cure a society in which men "had grown mechanical in head and heart". Contemporary political philosophy too was useless as it treated man abstractly, as though human motivations could be reduced to a mathematical calculus. There was, on the other hand, a neglected "dynamical" principle, man's natural energies, feelings and capacities for which only "Moralists, Poets and Priests" could speak. Carlyle draws upon Schiller's inspiring teleology of the spirit, but more fundamentally on his Scottish masters' conception of the historical dynamic of social development. That social change could be described as an historical unfolding through definite stages of development influenced Hegel and Marx among others. It is Carlyle's understanding of historical change that lifts *Signs of the Times* above pessimism, despite its excoriation of modern life. Carlyle sees the present as "the darkness before the dawn". Political freedom was the object, as he put it, but not the end: it is towards "a higher freedom than mere freedom from oppression...that man dimly aims".³⁹ The key to this future lies in the hearts of individuals; they must first reform themselves before the reformation of a nation or a world can begin.

Concluding in this exalted way, *Signs of the Times* signals its Romantic origins, but vast though the hope is the difficulty of the task is made starkly clear. The obdurate reality of this world lays an almost impossible challenge at the door of every sentient person. Carlyle is impervious to the "eupeptic social optimism" that Davie thinks characteristic of Idealist thought.⁴⁰ He invested hope in the growing number of educated minds because they would come to understand the moral imperative in their own hearts for freedom and justice, and then pursue the political and social reforms that were needed.

Carlyle's sense of divine justice at work in history, though formulated in Romantic terms, rests on his contention that the ideal of justice is innate and cannot be proved by logic. This is one of Reid's a priori first principles of Common Sense. Similar arguments founding social change on moral self-understanding were advanced by the British Idealists, including Green, most of whom found early inspiration in Carlyle.⁴¹

Carlyle's argument is a demand placed upon individuals to accept their mutual responsibilities in a world made by God for man. Self-knowledge must precede and be the wellspring of morally purposeful action, the foundation of all progressive social change. Radicals from Priestley to Maurice and Cobbett denigrated the introspective imperative as an anachronistic Scottish predilection that marked a failure to engage with contemporary material realities. Their misapprehension is particularly evident in relation to Carlyle who had a very clear grasp of the material challenges facing society. Davie argues (against Smout) that the error in the Radicals' faith in material development as the engine of social improvement was that, in neglecting the moral dimension, it would only produce further atomisation and alienation. Davie defends the Common Sense position, held by Carlyle, that moral and material development could not be separated.⁴² The central place of moral motivation in Idealist social theory and practice, and their belief in the organic, corporate identity of society, shows that Liberal welfare reform was permeated by the Carlylean perspective, and not merely produced by political or utilitarian calculation.

On the evidence of *Signs of the Times* Realism cohabited with Idealism in Carlyle's mind. It emerges powerfully in *Sartor Resartus* in 1832, which has been described as marking "the transition from the Romantic to the Victorian periods".⁴³ His doctrine of

natural supernaturalism, propounded in *Sartor Resartus*, is not, on the face of it, remote from Coleridge, but where Coleridge sees reality as a spiritual unity Carlyle offers a vision of mind and matter conjoined under a greater principle but not unified. As Jessop shows, this is entirely consistent with the tradition of Common Sense. Natural supernaturalism is closer to what Hamilton called Reid's natural dualism than to Coleridge. Le Quesne (1993) considers the "universe of two separate, but intimately related, orders" to be "highly original and of compelling force".⁴⁴ The Scottish dualist philosophy in which Carlyle was educated seems to be overlooked by le Quesne, although he ascribes the entwining of the material (natural) and the spiritual (supernatural) in Carlyle's thought to Calvinism.⁴⁵ That this deep structure of Carlyle's thought has Scottish origins rather than German is suggested by his equal interest in monists like Fichte and Schelling on the one hand and dualists like Kant and Richter on the other. More significant, however, is the example of Goethe, an intuitive dualist, for whom the infinitely varied cosmos is to be accepted gratefully as given by God, existing independently of cognition and not to be grasped by the intellect but apprehended as a whole, spirit and matter, through immediate intuition.

Though the poetics of Schiller had a powerful effect on him, Carlyle's writings show that he recoiled from the ultimate step of transposing matter into mind. This seems to be proof that Carlyle was moved most by the visionary spirit of German Idealism, adapting what he found congenial to a conception of reality that was persistently dualistic. If Jessop makes clear the Scottish philosophical foundations of Carlyle's thought, le Quesne has called him "a product of Scottish Calvinism, incongruously mixed with German Romanticism".⁴⁶ I would suggest that the incongruity is more apparent than real. Ian Finlay also approaches *Sartor Resartus* from the side of Carlyle's native

religion: it is, he says, “lit from end to end with the fires of Calvinism”.⁴⁷ The moral nobility of Work in Carlyle’s writings le Quesne attributes to his Calvinist background. Work, of whatever sort, was the antidote to spiritual and social collapse; man perfects himself by working, and though work achieves an inner harmony of being.⁴⁸ Calvinism provided the native theological ground on which Reid founded Common Sense and Carlyle his concept of natural supernaturalism. The separation of the human and divine is unbridgeable in Calvinist doctrine, and the limitation of human reason imposes an inescapable conditionality upon knowledge. The perfectibility of man in God as propounded by Romantic monism leads to the ultimate arrogance that (as Davie says of Locke’s theory of mind) “one day man could storm heaven and sit on the seats of the Gods”.⁴⁹ This is wholly un-Carlylean hubris. In many ways Carlyle’s image of the complete man was given to him by his father and, raised to the level of genius, by Goethe, in whom intellectual balance was simple, the product of their capacity to accept the world as it is in “a grateful and pious spirit”.⁵⁰ But for modern man, including Carlyle himself and the fictional Teufelsdröckh, if balance were to be restored it could only be through pain and struggle.

Carlyle’s Influence

Carlyle is the pivotal figure in the transmission of Scottish Enlightenment and German Romantic values into the broader current of British social theory in the second half of the 19th century. He was the heir of Common Sense in his principle that man’s intuitive sense of justice must be revived to become the engine of social transformation. His task was to re-moralise society, to create a foundation on which the mechanism of the economy might function for the improvement of real lives. This is the reason why he felt no need to lay out a practical programme for reform, which he left to others

including Ruskin and William Smart. In 1843, the year of the Great Disruption, Carlyle published *Past and Present* and with it reached his greatest influence in Victorian society. In comparing the modern period and the life of the abbey of St. Edmundsbury in the 12th century Carlyle did not idealise the mediaeval period but saw its inhabitants suspended in the living, luminous, substance of faith, as natural and unquestioned as the air they breathed. Man's world then (Carlyle makes plain) had a completeness and meaning which the fractured and recalcitrant present, plagued by 'Dilettantism' and devoted to 'Mammonism', could not match.⁵¹ Le Quesne calls *Past and Present* "in some ways the fullest and weightiest of Carlyle's social pronouncements".⁵² Typically, the book does not concern itself with the practical politics of reform but exhorts its readers to accept the demands of conscience and the urgent claim of social justice. In Le Quesne's judgement, *Past and Present* gave an anxious generation the assurance that history was just, life purposeful, and individual life fulfilled through "socially responsible work", and describes its impact on the novels of Mrs. Gaskell, Dickens, Kingsley and Disraeli.⁵³ I would add that Carlyle's presentation of mediaeval wholeness, including the wholeness of purposeful labour, directly inspired the aesthetic mediaevalism and social ideals of Ruskin, Morris and the Arts and Crafts movement.

Carlyle's native dualism emerges in *Past and Present* because the material reality of the world created by God was an unquestioned fact in the continuum of belief, as it had been for his father and Goethe. His chapter *The Progress of Human Society* again reveals his Scottish inheritance.⁵⁴ He holds that laissez-faire complacency among the prosperous is the source of social injustice, and demands a programme of reform and a spiritual rebirth. Men will once again hear the inner voice of justice, that theme both Calvinistic and Reidian. Carlyle upholds the principle of introspection as essential to

grasp the intuition of justice as the foundation of social life, a position wholly consistent with Common Sense. Each person must undertake “a descent into the inner man”, to “cease to be a hollow sounding-shell” and become “a faithful discerning soul”.⁵⁵

If Carlyle’s thought contains an irreducible Scottish core so too did that of Ruskin, Carlyle’s disciple from the 1850s onwards.⁵⁶ These two dominating moralists, the ones of most direct importance to the Idealists, shared a common Scottish Calvinist background. It is explicit that their Calvinism, though modified by Romanticism, was the foundation of their attitudes and their work.⁵⁷ In the early phase of Ruskin’s intellectual life, as he began to fall under the spell of Carlyle (which he did fully in *The Stones of Venice* in 1851, by his own account) he shared with the older man a similar set of religious and philosophical anchors. Politically both were anti-democrats who looked beyond politics to individual conscience for the source of social renewal.⁵⁸ In *Sesame and Lilies* (1871), Ruskin gave his list of priorities: to feed, clothe and shelter; then the things of the mind would follow. The material needs of the poor had to be solved, but the realisation of their moral potential was not to be indefinitely postponed by the turpitude of their social betters. Ruskin remained true to the conviction that moral regeneration was fundamental, enunciated by Carlyle but belonging first to the religion of his childhood. Ruskin had already adopted Carlyle’s doctrine of social involvement when in 1854 he began teaching in the Christian Socialists’ Working Men’s College.⁵⁹ Hilton (1985) sees in this commitment, which Ruskin sustained for about six years, a desire to give practical service to society. Yet though Ruskin perhaps inevitably ended his productive life in despair, his effort to devise an economic as well as a moral critique went further than Carlyle as did his re-conceptualising of Work as creatively

fulfilling labour. In Cate's (1976) estimation, he renewed Carlyle's relevance for the next generation, that of Green, Caird and Smart.⁶⁰

Although Green rejected the reactionary politics of Carlyle and Ruskin, his biographer Henry Sidgwick recorded that he "always associated Green with the Puritans and Carlyle".⁶¹ What he admired in Carlyle, as Richter describes, was his presentation of history as the unfolding of God's revelation, and his hatred of scepticism, the 'cash nexus' and the degradation of the modern worker. Perhaps he was receptive too to Carlyle's natural supernaturalism in so far as he too maintained the distinction between nature and spirit. From Carlyle certainly he derived his belief that the conscience of the privileged had to be aroused if social reform were to forestall revolution.⁶² For Green "Christian citizenship" (his term for active citizenship) was the foundation of ethical life. Like the Christian Socialists, Green's goal was paternalistic brotherhood – reconciliation between the classes, the recognition of the common interest of all, and evolutionary change guided from the top. His constant theme was the moralisation of society by the advantaged classes taking up the challenge of their responsibilities to the disadvantaged. That social change in the last analysis rested upon individuals listening to and acting on their consciences aligns him with the thought of Carlyle, and his ideal of active citizenship, awakened by Jowett, resonates too with the ideas of Ferguson, though now in democratic clothes.⁶³ For Green, active citizenship was the prerequisite for moral and personal development, and from him the high seriousness of citizenship entered adult education via Toynbee, Barnett, Mansbridge and Henry Jones.

Balliol and the University Extension and Settlement Movements

Through Jowett, Green and Toynbee, Balliol had led Oxford's Extension movement in the late 1870s and 1880s, Toynbee working with Samuel and Henrietta Barnett in Whitechapel before his early death in 1883.⁶⁴ The Barnetts' educational work included, from 1881, the annual Pictures for the Poor exhibitions, ancestors of the Art for the People scheme.⁶⁵ Following Toynbee's death Samuel Barnett persuaded Oxford University to found Toynbee Hall, the first of the University Settlements, in 1885. Harrison (1954) shows the links between the 'Greenites of the Right' who founded the Christian Social Union in 1889 and the WEA, through Mansbridge who also admired Ruskin and the Christian Socialists.⁶⁶ Education, Mansbridge wrote, makes possible the use of knowledge for "ministering to the common good".⁶⁷ Lewis (1993) and Fieldhouse (1996) see the WEA as an instrument used by Asquith's government to influence working class education against increasing political militancy and the influence of the independent working class education movement.⁶⁸ Whatever the government's motive, however, Rose (2001) has convincingly demonstrated that WEA classes were not ideologically determined. Their dedication to balanced discussion and analysis was, in fact, valued by working class students, many being socialists active in the labour movement.⁶⁹

The WEA's association with Oxford was confirmed by the 1907 conference that brought together the WEA, moderate elements of the labour movement and Oxford University. Among the speakers were Samuel Barnett and the Scottish philosopher Robert Flint, representing the Working Men's College and called by Davie "the last original thinker of the Scottish school".⁷⁰ The memory of Green (whose widow was present) was invoked. The conference ended with a promise of state financial support

from Sir Robert Morant, Permanent Secretary of the Board of Education, who had been persuaded by Mansbridge that the WEA was “a sound political investment”.⁷¹ A joint committee was formed representing the WEA and Oxford, among its members being Mansbridge and Philip Snowden for the WEA and A. L. Smith and H. B. Lees Smith for the university.⁷² When Lloyd George appointed the Adult Education Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction in 1917, Oxford men like Smith (Caird’s successor as Master of Balliol) were prominent among its members, contributing also to *The 1919 Report*.⁷³

Scottish Connections

Richter (1964) has pointed out that Idealist social theory had more radical interpretations too. Vincent and Plant support this view, on the grounds that Idealism has been attacked from both left and right.⁷⁴ In 1886 the London Ethical Society was formed, a meeting-ground for the ‘Greenites of the Left’, those who were not High Church Anglicans.⁷⁵ Its origin lay among Idealists who considered that Barnett’s pragmatism was neglecting the philosophical spirit of Green and Toynbee. Although it was not necessary to be an Idealist they were at the heart of the membership, several Scots prominent among them. J. H. Muirhead, one of its founders, edited the society’s journal and Caird served a term as President.⁷⁶ In 1897 it became the School of Ethics and Social Philosophy, eventually becoming a department of the London School of Economics. Richter sees this process as marking the shift from the era of the voluntary group motivated by moral duty, to participation in the development of social policy in Britain. The London Ethical Society helped to transmit Idealist values into the public policy process in the first decades of the 20th century and, with the Sociological Society of Geddes and Branford, into the wider stream of social theory.

In Scotland, Caird, Henry Jones and Smart were the democratic heirs of Carlyle and Ruskin, committed to social reform and personal service. Caird like Green was a politically engaged believer in a progressive, paternalist state who took an active interest in women's labour and union organisation.⁷⁷ Jones, a supporter of the WEA and university extra-mural education, was influential within the Liberal Party. Hetherington records:

With the Labour party...he had a quarrel which seemed to turn less on anything in its programme than on its name. The name implied, he thought, an appeal to a sectional interest...and though he agreed that other classes had sufficiently exploited the manual workers, he believed it to be 'a corruption of their citizenship to invite the workers merely to reverse the situation'.⁷⁸

Jones's passion was education for citizenship. As Vincent and Plant (1984) put it, true citizenship for Jones was founded on the service of one's fellows, as the expression of higher values that overcome competitive individualism and social division.⁷⁹ The state's responsibility was to provide education which would be "a social healer and a class leveller", encompassing moral guidance and an ultimate aim to improve the condition of society.⁸⁰ It was largely as a result of Jones's pressure (according to Hetherington) that Lloyd George set up the Ministry of Reconstruction's Adult Education Committee.⁸¹ Caird's political interests were shared by William Smart.⁸² As Professor of Political Economy at Glasgow, a position created for him by Caird, Smart appointed Tom Jones as his assistant in 1899. Tom Jones recorded the influences under which Smart committed himself to economics. Ruskin was one, but:

The chief factor...was undoubtedly the doctrine of Idealism as interpreted by Edward Caird, who for over quarter of a century...dominated the philosophical thinking of Scotland, and through his pupils still continues to influence the philosophical teaching of most of the universities of this country and the colonies. Edward Caird has been described as perhaps the greatest teacher of his generation. To him and his brother must largely be attributed the change in the religious beliefs of Scotland within the last generation... With Carlyle and Ruskin, Edward Caird challenged the materialism and "common sense" of his time. But he had not so much a more profound as a more logical grasp of the organic unity of human life and its rationality than had the two prose-poets. And he showed how his belief in the spirit and reason of the world was connected with the principle of development through conflict which had newly received at the hands of Darwin a remarkable illustration.⁸³

Smart's Idealism is exposed by his lifelong concern with the place of economics in realising the ultimate meaning of society, not merely in securing its material prosperity.⁸⁴ Smart credited Carlyle and particularly Ruskin (whom he knew well) with being the inspiration of his intellectual life.⁸⁵ In the 1870s he joined the Guild of St. George and in 1880 became the first President of the Glasgow Ruskin Society. His belief that "Life is the real wage" is an echo of Ruskin married to the Idealist credo that wealth has no value other than as a means to attain the divine purpose of life.⁸⁶ Workers' housing was a major interest of Smart's from the 1880s onwards, growing out of his involvement with the Glasgow Social Union. He must have been aware of Patrick Geddes' contemporary work with the Edinburgh Social Union, not least through the economist James Mavor who was active in both.⁸⁷ It seems likely that it was through

Smart that Tom Jones met Geddes in 1901. Morality and economics were no more separable for Smart than for Ruskin or Geddes. From Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris Smart received an elevated concept of morally fulfilling work. The highest claim of the working man (he wrote) is for work that will “make a man” of him, another echo of Ruskin who wrote that modern industry makes everything but men. To the influence of Ruskin and Caird on the growing climate for social reform, Tom Jones adds the popular impact of American visitors to Glasgow in 1879, the evangelists Moody and Sankey and the economist Henry George. Caird, Moody and Sankey and George stood, Tom Jones says, for three “plans for salvation”. “Caird’s men” he says:

...urged the wise of the west-end to carry the treasures of knowledge to the denizens of the east end. They gave the Christian principle of dying to live applications which were then new and strange. Selfishness was not overcome by postponing its gratification to the next world but by social service in this. The State was a moral institution and civic duty a spiritual function. This world was not to be spurned, but to be embraced and possessed, for within it there was nothing finally and absolutely secular.⁸⁸

The wise of the west-end: the conscience of the better-off classes was the target of Caird’s message, as it had been for Carlyle, Ruskin and Green. Equally interesting is the subtle dualism: that if nothing in this world is absolutely secular, neither can it be absolutely spiritual. I would suggest that this was Tom Jones’s conviction too, when he wrote these words in 1916. Caird and Smart took a special interest in the University Extension and Settlement movements and both supported higher education for women.⁸⁹ Inspired by Barnett’s work at Toynbee Hall, Caird was behind the opening, in 1886, of

Toynbee House, the Glasgow University Settlement with which Smart was associated for many years. A student settlement in Possil followed, encouraged by Henry Jones, which attracted Tom Jones and later Hector Hetherington to live and work there.⁹⁰ Smart persuaded Glasgow University to begin evening classes, following the initiative of graduates including Henry Jones and Muirhead.⁹¹ When Ruskin Hall opened in Oxford in 1899, Smart personally gave financial assistance to Glasgow working-class students who were selected, which demonstrates that there was no uniform anxiety among Idealists about its ideological character.⁹² In 1916, Tom Jones revealed his preference for Smart's social outlook over any other. Most labour is inhuman (Jones writes) and there are only three solutions on offer, the aesthetic, the political and the moral. Kipling stands for the first, Morris and communism for the second and Smart for the last.⁹³ Smart's way is to ask for a moral revolution:

Our escape from the bondage of machinery and soulless work lies in a change of mind and heart – lies, in a word, in a social religion which will moralise our economic relationships.⁹⁴

Smart may question Ruskin's economics and Carlyle's lack of any, but he and Tom Jones are with both, with Thomas Reid and the Common Sense tradition, and with the Calvinist preachers and philanthropists, in founding the motive for social change on man's innate sense of justice. This was the deep, consistent message brought from at least the 18th century by an unbroken line of Scottish thinkers to 20th century currents of social reform.

The Charity Organisation Society

Adult education and social voluntarism were the inseparable twins of Idealist practical action. A feature of the biographies of several Idealists, notably Bernard Bosanquet, William Smart, Henry Jones and (later) Alexander MacBeath, was membership of the Charity Organisation Society (COS).⁹⁵ Idealism provided the COS with its social theory, especially through the work of Bosanquet. From 1875 to 1914 the secretary of the COS was Charles Loch (1849-1923), a Scottish follower of Green described by William Beveridge as “an idealist with a critical intellect”.⁹⁶ According to Finlayson (1994) the example of Thomas Chalmers remained important to Loch.⁹⁷ But as early as 1884 the Fabian Society considered its principles, founded on the distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor, to be outdated.⁹⁸ In the period up to 1914 COS policy was cautious towards welfare reform, favouring a balance weighted towards the responsibility of individuals for themselves over the state’s responsibility for the collective good. To socialist reformers like the Webbs, the COS merely represented a crumbling bastion of individualism, an obstacle to state welfare as a right.

Co-ordination between charities and co-operation with the state was a growing theme in the years before the First World War. In 1897 the COS annual conference was held in Glasgow. The leading figures in the Glasgow COS were Henry Jones and William Smart, and Jones was the main speaker at the conference. The theme was co-ordination among charities. Jones advocated a process of harmonisation between (for example) Glasgow’s charities, their co-ordination eventually to come under local municipal control. Loch, however, opposed any closer relationship with local or national government, positing the COS as an independent co-ordinating body for the UK.⁹⁹ The tension between the COS and socialist opponents about the role of the state emerged

during the Poor Law Commission of 1905-1909.¹⁰⁰ *The Majority Report* recommended retaining the Poor Law, supplemented by Public Assistance Committees on which voluntary organisations would be represented. This compromise, Layburn says, bore “the indelible mark of the COS... stamped there by...Loch and Helen Bosanquet”.¹⁰¹ Smart took the majority side, preferring a mixture of state welfare and voluntary activity to Beatrice Webb’s *Minority Report* that argued that voluntary charitable work should be superseded by a radical extension of state welfare. Tom Jones too favoured a mixed economy of state and voluntary action, though Harris notes that he admired *The Minority Report* on the grounds that it embodied “the Platonic conception of the state as an educational establishment”.¹⁰²

Before the First World War, then, voluntary organisations retained their independent position, but in a rapidly changing field in which Victorian individualism was becoming ever more outdated. Co-ordination between organisations and with the state was increasingly seen as a necessity. William Beveridge (at one time warden of Toynbee Hall) believed, for example, that “the vast network of voluntary self-help organisations should...no longer be seen as alternatives to state action, but should be brought into co-operation with the machinery of state”.¹⁰³ Finlayson notes that the emerging partnership was founded on the conviction that ‘nationalisation’ of welfare by the state was “inimical to the spirit of voluntarism”.¹⁰⁴ A new accommodation was hastened by the First World War, which involved the state in a massive intervention into industrial and social organisation that changed the horizons for the voluntary sector. Loch’s retirement in 1914 perhaps eased the way for change. In 1915 the COS co-sponsored the Conference on War Relief and Personal Service out of which, in 1919, the NCSS was to emerge with a national co-ordinating role. Voluntary welfare was naturally most

concerned with problems of health, housing, old age, the needs of children and the disabled, employment and rural depopulation. However, issues of community life and individual development created intersections with adult education and the arts, as I have discussed and as Beveridge recorded in 1948.¹⁰⁵

Scottish Idealists after the First World War

In 1918 Hetherington and Muirhead published *Social Purpose*, a major statement of late Idealist social theory that pays special attention to the foundations of democratic citizenship. They interpret the First World War as a clash between two opposing civic theories, the German (developed from Fichte) which has led to the domination of the state, and the British, predicated on individualism. The war has shown the error of the German collectivist model but, in creating a deeper sense of national unity and of common citizenship and values, has shown how the British can be improved for post-war reconstruction. A “central and guiding idea” is needed to gain the allegiance of a complex society, and that idea can only be active citizenship.¹⁰⁶ Believing that learning democratic citizenship grows naturally out of the child’s experience, they argue for education in schools covering:

...an intelligent conception of the nature of civic society, in relation to the individual, to other societies within and similar societies without, and finally to the great family of Humanity yet to be born....¹⁰⁷

In Idealist fashion, they insist on the corporate reality of society, but (perhaps responding to the criticisms of the sceptical realist Graham Wallas) they do not posit some sort of “mystical supra-social person”.¹⁰⁸ Their approach is psychologistic, the

general will emerging from “instincts, habits and dispositions” which are not merely individual but common to people as innately social beings. The authors turn their political argument on the fact that because individual wills may be opposed to the larger collectivity, education is essential to secure the bonds of society. The growth of the moral personality comes from taking an interest in social objects beyond the self, which in turn offers some protection against an over-mighty state.¹⁰⁹ To be a citizen is to merge one’s being with that of others while the purpose of the state is to steer a middle course between individualism and collectivism. The state’s duty now is to make possible through education “the winning and enrichment of human personality”, a principle that Hetherington advocated for adult education in the 1930s.¹¹⁰

A slightly later book from the Glasgow Idealist camp attends to the place of the arts in the larger social scheme. Written by A. K. White and Alexander Macbeath (who was to play an important part in establishing an independent CEMA in Northern Ireland during the war) *The Moral Self: Its Nature and Development* (1923) was a textbook for student teachers.¹¹¹ White and MacBeath’s argument is generally similar to Hetherington and Muirhead’s in its emphasis on the organic nature of society and in the role given to moral consciousness. They are less explicitly concerned with citizenship, but as an underlying presence it emerges in their Kantian conclusion that men are ends in themselves, and that the only concrete universals in which the collective mind is realised are the family, the school, the church and the state.¹¹² Art is given considerable attention because the moral self must be realised in three mutual aspects: as feeling (pleasure); as ‘will’ (duty) and as intellect (contemplation). The aesthetic is essential to the social development of the individual but it cannot occupy the highest position because while people are always social, they are only sometimes artistic.¹¹³ The authors

argue that the full life is the ethical life realised in service for others, which is not dependent on special capacities, knowledge or external factors. Aesthetic experience, nevertheless, gives the individual insight into their participation in a greater whole, which is given concrete reality through social action. As with the moral sense, social practice is made to rest on introspective self-understanding and the recognition of similar capacities in others, a position in the mainstream of Scottish social thought.

Idealism had provided the philosophical and ethical framework of *The 1919 Report*. Although he did not contribute to its writing, Henry Jones's spirit breathes strongly through the committee's advocacy of education for citizenship.¹¹⁴ In *The First Interim Report* (1918) the committee argued that "democracy can only be operative through an educational community." The motivation of adult students was "the development of personality", which included their intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic capacities. Beyond this, however, students had a larger motive "directed towards rendering themselves better fitted for the responsibilities of membership in political, social and industrial education", evidence of a wide appreciation of "the responsibilities of citizenship".¹¹⁵ The aesthetic (as White and Macbeath argued a few years later) was part of the human personality that must be developed for individual and social good. Citizenship encompasses all the aspects that contribute to an individual's capacity to participate in civil life, as Hetherington and Muirhead also argued.

Similar sentiments run through *The 1919 Report*, which asserts again that the goal of adult education is social improvement. The report offers a prescription for active citizenship, active both in the sense of participation and of informed and critical engagement. It expresses confidence that, if asked, the majority of adult students would

agree that “the object of adult education is...to lay the foundations of more intelligent citizenship and of a better social order.”¹¹⁶ To spread adult education more widely and evenly through society is fundamental to “good citizenship and national well-being”.¹¹⁷ What emerges, then, from this evidence is that adult education, including an aesthetic component, was aimed at developing human personality in the round to create citizens equal to the demands of mass democracy by instilling a powerful ethic of civic responsibility and independence of mind. In generating demands for social reform, the First World War created the opportunity for the late florescence of Idealist-inspired social action that Harris identified. Through *The 1919 Report* and the work of bodies like the NCSS and the BIAE, practical Idealism was projected afresh into adult education and the voluntary sector.

A final example of the strength of the Scottish contribution to Idealist social thought between the wars is the work of A. D. Lindsay, a colleague of MacBeath and Hetherington at Glasgow in the early 1920s and subsequently Master of Balliol. Lindsay shared with Tom Jones (whom he knew) a belief that modern democracy had its origins in Calvinism and Puritanism, in their sense of the “formation of a common mind” among the community of the faithful.¹¹⁸ Lindsay was convinced of Idealism’s fundamental correctness. Its core (he wrote) was the “the combination of the spirit of scientific enquiry with an unhesitating belief in the reality of moral experience”.¹¹⁹ Lindsay led the ‘exemplary life’ of a social service paternalist common to all the major Idealists, active, for example, in the WEA and playing a leading role in founding an educational settlement in the Rhondda during the coal crisis of 1928-29. It was at his instigation (in 1926) that the first moves were made which culminated in the creation of the Scottish Branch of the BIAE. He was committed to the occupational club movement

in the early 1930s, which he played a part in creating, and strongly advocated the inclusion of the arts and crafts in their activities. He was active, with Tom Jones, in the NCSS, chairing its Unemployment Committee from 1933.¹²⁰ Lindsay's was another influential voice arguing that government should finance social voluntarism but leave the actual work to the voluntary organisations themselves. He saw the University Grants Committee as a model that would not undermine the role of voluntary action, and argued that it should be applied to the voluntary sector and adult education.¹²¹

Tom Jones and Aesthetic Education

Tom Jones had never regarded individuals as merely political and economic actors. As early as 1900 he had criticised the South Wales Miners' Federation for concentrating on wage bargaining to the exclusion of their members' intellectual and spiritual welfare, a failure, as he saw it, of civic responsibility.¹²² A collector of handcrafted furniture himself and for many years deeply involved with the Gregynog Press, Jones was aware of the narrowness of the early adult education movement. More than 30 years later he criticised the pioneers:

...who did not make enough allowance for the play instinct in man, for the place of entertainment in the scheme of things. They left it out of their calculations. But man is neither mere spirit nor mere mind, and education of the feelings and through the feelings is now seen to be of great importance. The native drama has made some headway in fifty years. A few young eyes have glimpsed the rich stuff of comedy and tragedy which is at our doors, in the common, immortal lives of butchers and bakers, in the interplay of characters which range all the way from savage to saint. You see the change...in the flourishing of dramatic

societies [and] in the prevalence of the cinema.... The education of the feelings, the emotions, is going on all around us all day through sight and sound... The education of the feelings is as important as the education of the mind.¹²³

He carried the same outlook over into his work for the occupational clubs. For him (as for Lindsay) the spontaneous appearance of the arts and crafts in the occupational clubs was evidence of their members' creative drive, essential to their not becoming a demoralised underclass. It was a message to the authorities that the full social value of the club movement could only be realised if this were encouraged. Echoing Ruskin, Morris, Geddes and the language of *The 1919 Report* (and behind them Smith and Ferguson) Jones wrote that opportunities for creative work in the clubs would help undo the spiritual damage caused by increasing division of labour.¹²⁴ If the unemployed were not to be segregated from the rest of society – if they were to remain fully competent citizens (as he, Lindsay and the NCSS were arguing) – the clubs had to become more than basic utilitarian workshops.

CEMA was thought of as a bulwark for participatory citizenship. Its two prime founders, Tom Jones and W. E. Williams, brought an inclusive social vision founded on the voluntary principle. Even the structure of CEMA as a corporate body bringing together 'purists' and 'populists' represents Jones's commitment to the principle of reconciliation through negotiation and discussion. More than this, Jones clearly believed that social reform and welfare were incomplete without the creative culture which education could stimulate. This thinking can be grounded in the Arts and Crafts movement but also in the ideas of Patrick Geddes and in the Scottish tradition running from Adam Smith through Carlyle to Ruskin that Jones encountered during his early

years in Glasgow. Jones's vision of CEMA, criticised by Keynes for its imputed low artistic horizons, stemmed from a refusal to separate the world of the professional and the highest standards of execution from the world of the local player or art club member. They formed not merely an artistic continuum but more importantly for Jones a social and ultimately a moral continuum in which each was necessary to the other.

¹ Perkin, op. cit. p. 130.

² Checkland, op. cit. p. 3.

³ Perkin, op. cit. pp. 118-119.

⁴ Becker, *The Emergence of Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century* (Indiana University Press, 1994), p. 58.

⁵ Hegel, in Avineri, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State* (Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 146.

⁶ Becker (op. cit. p. 30) discusses the continental precursors of Scottish social theory.

⁷ Avineri, op. cit. p. 4 and p. 142.

⁸ Winch, *Adam Smith's Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 176-177.

⁹ Berry, *Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh University Press, 1997), pp. 144-145. This was repeated by Jeffrey in the 1820s who feared that without it there would come "a mutual exchange of property and conditions" (Chitnis, *The Scottish Enlightenment & Early Victorian English Society* (London, Croom Helm, 1986), p. 169.

¹⁰ Carlyle, *Past and Present* (London, Chapman and Hall, 1899), pp. 264-266.

¹¹ Avineri, op. cit. pp. 150-151.

¹² Harris, in Gladstone, op. cit. p. 62.

¹³ Jones, *Leeks and Daffodils*, op. cit. p. 69.

¹⁴ Jones, *Welsh Broth*, op. cit. p. 22.

¹⁵ Harris, in Gladstone, op. cit. p. 49.

¹⁶ Soffer, p. 107; Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit; A Social History of Britain, 1870-1914* (Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 230.

¹⁷ Harris, in Gladstone, op. cit. pp. 47 and 54.

¹⁸ Jones, *Welsh Broth*, op. cit. pp. 20-22.

¹⁹ Faber, *Jowett, a portrait with background* (London, Faber and Faber, 1957), p. 178.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 180.

²¹ Davie, *The Democratic Intellect* (Edinburgh University Press, 1961), pp. 333-334.

²² Ibid. pp. 332-333. Copelson (*A History of Philosophy*, London, Search Press, 1975, pp. 180-182) gives a detailed account of Caird's compromise.

²³ Copelston, op. cit., pp. 230-232.

²⁴ Ergang, *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism* (New York, Octagon, 1976) pp. 85, 88 and 233-234.

²⁵ Founded in 1848 by the Broad Church Coleridgeans Maurice, Ludlow and Kingsley (Thompson, *William Morris*, London, Merlin Press, 1977, p. 24). They were inspired by *Past and Present* and by the Chartist campaign.

²⁶ Hayes, *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism* (New York, Russell and Russell, 1968) pp. 266-267.

²⁷ That the 'England' referred to by the Christian Socialists was, on the whole, England and not Britain is implicit, for example, in Kingsley's reference to "the noblest nation and the noblest church which the world ever saw" (Hartley, *The Novels of Charles Kingsley: A Christian Social Interpretation* (Folkestone, Hour-Glass Press, 1977, pp. 12-14). Maurice's English nationalism is as well documented as his dislike of Scots.

²⁸ Davie, *The Democratic Intellect*, op. cit. p. 263.

²⁹ Ibid. pp. 234-236 and p. 241.

³⁰ Finlay, *Scotland* (London, Chatto and Windus, 1957), pp. 173-174. Finlay was writing in 1957 when he was a member of the Scottish Committee.

³¹ Cunningham, *The Idealistic Argument in Recent British and American Philosophy* (New York and London, The Century Co., 1933), p. 14. Ferrier rebutted the accusation that Hegel stood behind his thinking, claiming that his Idealism was “Scottish to the core” and “of home growth and national texture” (Cunningham, p. 37). Cunningham and Copleston support his contention.

³² Davie, *The Democratic Intellect*, op. cit. p. 332.

³³ Hegel does not seem to have figured in Carlyle’s reading. His mature literary style perhaps owed something to Richter. Writing about Richter in 1824, Carlyle described his style as “figures without limit; indeed the whole is a tissue of metaphors, and similies, and allusions to all the provinces of Earth, Sea and Air; interlaced with epigrammatic breaks, vehement bursts, or sardonic turns, interjections, quips, puns, and even oaths!”

³⁴ Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement* (New York, Octagon, 1972), pp. 150-152.

³⁵ Campbell, in Clubbe (Ed), *Carlyle and His Contemporaries* (Durham (North Carolina), Duke University, 1976), pp. 5-19.

³⁶ Carlyle, *Signs of the Times*, pp. 64-65. Reid’s grounding of his first principles on instinct was, in Carlyle’s opinion, to take the ‘mechanical’ path with Hume to “the bottomless pit of Atheism and Fatalism”. As he put it, the Scots had “let loose Instinct, as an indiscriminate ban-dog to guard them”. Instinct, an attribute of the animal in man, was not for Carlyle the same as God-given intuition, and was therefore another form of physicalism.

³⁷ Jessop, *Carlyle and Scottish Thought* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1997, p. 11) notes that scholars of Carlyle’s relationship with the German writers agree that his fundamental beliefs were formed before he discovered them and that it was their “spirit” more than their ideas that impressed itself upon him.

³⁸ Ibid. p. 58. Davie calls *Signs of the Times* ‘Hamiltonian’ in its attack on social atomisation (*The Scottish Enlightenment and other Essays*, p. 79).

³⁹ Ibid. p. 82.

⁴⁰ Davie, *The Democratic Intellect*, op. cit. p. 265.

⁴¹ Chitnis, op. cit., discusses the transmission of ‘Scotch knowledge’ into England in the first half of the 19th century. Dugald Stewart preceded Carlyle as a public oracle.

⁴² See Davie, *The Scottish Enlightenment and other Essays*, op. cit. pp. 55-58.

⁴³ McSweeney and Sabor, introduction to Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus* (Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 1.

⁴⁴ Le Quesne, op. cit. p. 18.

⁴⁵ A prime example of this is James Hogg’s *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824).

⁴⁶ Le Quesne, op. cit. p. v.

⁴⁷ Finlay, *Scotland*, op. cit. p. 174.

⁴⁸ Chitnis, op. cit. p. 200.

⁴⁹ Davie, *The Social Significance of the Scottish Philosophy of Common Sense*, in *The Scottish Enlightenment and other Essays*, op. cit. p. 84.

⁵⁰ Gilbert and Kuhn, *A History of Aesthetics* (New York, Dover, 1972), p. 345.

⁵¹ “The great antique heart: how like a child’s in its simplicity, like a man’s in its earnestness and depth! Heaven lies over him wheresoever he goes or stands on the Earth; making all the Earth a mystic Temple to him, the Earth’s business all a kind of worship.” (Carlyle, *Past and Present*, p. 116).

⁵² Le Quesne, op. cit. p. 72

⁵³ Ibid. pp. 77-78.

⁵⁴ Carlyle, *Past and Present*, op. cit. p. 20.

⁵⁵ Ibid. pp. 25-26.

⁵⁶ Cate, in Clubbe, op. cit. p. 227. In Vol. 3 of *Modern Painters* (1856) Ruskin wrote “Carlyle’s stronger thinking coloured my own”. Cate (ibid. p. 227) adds that on many occasions in the last 30 years of his life Ruskin referred to Carlyle as his master.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 232.

⁵⁸ Hilton, *John Ruskin: The Early Years* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1985), p. 203.

⁵⁹ Despite this, Ruskin kept his distance from Christian Socialism.

⁶⁰ Cate, in Clubbe, op. cit. p. 256.

⁶¹ Richter, *The Politics of Conscience: T. H. Green and his Age* (London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964), p. 48. Green regarded both Coleridge and Carlyle as philosophically confused (Green, op. cit. p. 87). Many other British philosophers who regarded Carlyle with some coolness nevertheless honoured his work for social reform or for promoting German Idealism. Among them were the Caird brothers and Hutchison Stirling (Jessop, op. cit. p. 15).

⁶² Richter, op. cit. p. 47.

-
- ⁶³ Soffer (op. cit. p. 194) credits Jowett's teaching of "civic responsibility" as the origin of Green's "civic altruism".
- ⁶⁴ Kelly, *A History of Adult Education in Great Britain* (Liverpool University Press, 1992), p. 239.
- ⁶⁵ The Christian Socialist journal had been called *Politics for the People*.
- ⁶⁶ Harrison, *A History of the Working Men's College, 1854-1954* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954), p. 144-145.
- ⁶⁷ Mansbridge, *An Adventure in Working Class Education* (London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1920), p. xv. He despised education merely for "getting on in life", an echo of Ruskin's condemnation of The Goddess of Getting On in the lecture *Traffic* (1866).
- ⁶⁸ Fieldhouse, *The 1908 Report: Antidote to Class Struggle?* in Harrop (Ed.), *Oxford and Working-class Education* (University of Nottingham, 1987), pp. 30-47; and Lewis, *Leaders and Teachers: Adult Education and the Challenge of Labour in South Wales, 1906-1940* (Studies in Welsh History 9, Cardiff, University of Wales, 1993), p. xxiii. Asquith was a student and a follower of Green.
- ⁶⁹ Rose, op. cit. pp. 256-297.
- ⁷⁰ Davie, *The Democratic Intellect*, op. cit. p. 272. Flint's presence is mentioned by Harrison, op. cit. p. 149. This was the first contact between the Working Men's College and the WEA. Davie writes of Flint with high praise and some melancholy as a neglected survivor of the days of Ferrier (Ibid. pp. 335-337).
- ⁷¹ Jennings, in Harrop, op. cit. pp. 17-18.
- ⁷² Lees Smith was Vice-Principle of Ruskin College, later Professor of Economics at University College, Bristol, an MP and Chancellor of the Exchequer. A friend of Jones's, he asked the Parliamentary question in April 1940 which brought the announcement of CEMA's founding as a Council.
- ⁷³ Harrop, op. cit. p. 5.
- ⁷⁴ Vincent and Plant, *Philosophy, Politics and Citizenship: The Life and Thought of the British Idealists*, (Oxford, Blackwell, 1984), p. 1.
- ⁷⁵ Richter, op. cit. p.121.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 120.
- ⁷⁷ Davie, *Scottish Philosophy and Robertson Smith*, in *The Scottish Enlightenment and other Essays*, op. cit. p.107.
- ⁷⁸ Hetherington, op. cit. pp.91-92.
- ⁷⁹ Boucher and Vincent, op. cit. *A Radical Hegelian: the Political and Social Philosophy of Henry Jones* (Cardiff, University of Wales, 1993), pp. 119-120.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid. pp. 100-102.
- ⁸¹ Hetherington, op. cit. p. 132.
- ⁸² Jones, in Smart, *Second Thoughts of an Economist* (London, Macmillan, 1916), p. xxv.
- ⁸³ Ibid. pp. xix-xx.
- ⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 10.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid. p. 2.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 72. Ruskin wrote "There is no wealth but life".
- ⁸⁷ James Mavor was interested in the arts, and close to the Glasgow School artists. He was the uncle of Osborne Mavor.
- ⁸⁸ Jones, in Smart, op. cit. pp. xxi-xxii.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid. p. xxiv.
- ⁹⁰ Illingworth, op. cit. p. 10.
- ⁹¹ Smart, op. cit. p. xxviii.
- ⁹² Ibid. p. xvii.
- ⁹³ Ibid. p. lxx.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid. p. lxxi.
- ⁹⁵ The COS was founded in 1869 by Octavia Hill, financed by Ruskin in its early days.
- ⁹⁶ Beveridge, *Voluntary Action*, op. cit. p. 144.
- ⁹⁷ Finlayson, op. cit. p. 77.
- ⁹⁸ Checkland, op. cit. p. 301.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid. pp. 315-316.
- ¹⁰⁰ Smart chaired the Documents Committee of the Commission and Tom Jones served as a Special Investigator for Scotland (Jones, *Welsh Broth*, op. cit. p. 71).
- ¹⁰¹ Layburn, op. cit. p. 165.
- ¹⁰² Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit; A Social History of Britain, 1870-1914*, op. cit. pp. 53-54.
- ¹⁰³ Quoted in Checkland, op. cit. p. 336.
- ¹⁰⁴ Finlayson, op. cit. p. 241.

¹⁰⁵ The British Drama League and Rural Music Schools are mentioned in Beveridge, *Voluntary Action*, pp. 301-302.

¹⁰⁶ Hetherington and Muirhead, op. cit. pp. 19-26.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. p. 83.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid. p. 112.

¹¹⁰ Ibid. pp. 222-223. They applaud John Burnett's criticism of the SED in *Higher Education and the War*, because its policy distorted the education system, making its first purpose training for the civil service.

¹¹¹ The book has an introduction by A.D. Lindsay. The bibliography reveals that the thinkers most referred to are Plato, Hegel and Bosanquet, followed by Green, Bradley, Hobhouse, Hetherington, Muirhead, Mackenzie, Seth and Stout. The authors clearly knew the earlier book by their colleagues at Glasgow.

¹¹² Macbeath and White, op. cit. pp. 181-183. The thinking again tends towards nationalism.

¹¹³ Ibid. pp. 176-177.

¹¹⁴ Taylor, in *The 1919 Report*, op. cit. p. 32.

¹¹⁵ *The First Interim Report*, in *The 1919 Report*, op. cit. pp. 54-55.

¹¹⁶ *The Final Report*, in *The 1919 Report*, op. cit. para. 56.

¹¹⁷ Ibid. paras. 179-210.

¹¹⁸ Scott, A.D. *Lindsay, A Biography* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1971), pp. 406-409.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. p.98.

¹²⁰ Ibid. pp. 155-158.

¹²¹ Ibid. p. 161.

¹²² Ellis, op. cit. pp. 104-105.

¹²³ Jones, *Workmen's Libraries* (November 1934), in *Leeks and Daffodils*, op. cit. pp. 139-140.

¹²⁴ Jones, *Adult Education and Unemployment: a Welsh Experiment* (May 1934), in *Leeks and Daffodils*, op. cit. p. 129.

Bibliography

Archives (acronyms)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Sources

Alexander, E., *Matthew Arnold, John Ruskin and the Modern Temper*, Ohio State University Press, 1973

Anderson, B., *Imagined Communities*, London and New York, Verso, 1991

Anderson, R.D., *Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland*, Edinburgh University Press, 1989

Anderson, R.D., *Education and the Scottish People 1750-1918*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995

Anonymous, *The Scottish Socialists: A Gallery of Contemporary Portraits*, London, Faber and Faber, 1931

Arnold, M., *Culture and Anarchy*, Cambridge University Press, 1963

Association of Directors of Education in Scotland, *The First Twenty-Five Years, 1920-1945*, Edinburgh, Association of Directors of Education in Scotland, undated

Avineri, S., *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State*, Cambridge University Press, 1972

Barasch, M., *Modern Theories of Art, 1: From Winckelmann to Baudelaire*, New York University Press, 1990

Barker, A., (Ed.), *Quangos in Britain, Government and the Networks of Public policy-Making*, London, Macmillan, 1982

Barrell, J., *The Political Theory of Painting from Reynolds to Hazlitt*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1986

Becker, M.B., *The Emergence of Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century*, Indiana University Press, 1994

Beckley, B., *John Ruskin: Lectures on Art*, New York, Allworth Press, 1996

Belford, A.J., *Centenary Handbook of the Educational Institute of Scotland*, Edinburgh, Educational Institute of Scotland, 1946

Bell, A.S. (Ed.), *The Scottish Antiquarian Tradition: Essays to mark the bicentenary of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 1780-1980*, Edinburgh University Press, 1980

Berry, C.J., *Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment*, Edinburgh University Press, 1997

Beveridge, C. and Turnbull, R., *The Eclipse of Scottish Culture*, Edinburgh, Polygon, 1989

- Beveridge, C., and Turnbull, R., *Scotland After Enlightenment*, Edinburgh, Polygon, 1997
- Beveridge, W.H., *Voluntary Action, A Report on Methods of Social Advance*, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1948
- Beveridge, W.H, and Wells, A.F., *The Evidence for Voluntary Action*, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1949
- Blackwood, J., *Portrait of a Young Scotsman; a life of Edward Baird 1904-1949*, London, Fleming-Wyfold Art Foundation, 2004
- Blaug, M., *The Economics of the Arts*, London, Robertson, 1976
- Blunt, W.J.W., *John Christie of Glyndebourne*, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1968
- Bold, A., (Ed.) *The Letters of Hugh MacDiarmid*, Athens (Ga), University of Georgia, 1984.
- Bone, T.R., *School Inspection in Scotland 1840 - 1966*, University of London, 1968
- Boardman, P., *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978
- Bosanquet, B., *A History of Aesthetic*, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1956
- Bosanquet, B., *Social and International Ideals*, London, Macmillan, 1916
- Borzello, F., *Civilising Caliban*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987
- Boucher, D., and Vincent, A., *A Radical Hegelian: the Political and Social Philosophy of Henry Jones*, Cardiff, University of Wales, 1993
- Bourdieu, P., and Darbel, A., *The Love of Art*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991
- Bradley, J.L., *Ruskin, The Critical Heritage*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984
- Brasnett, M., *Voluntary Social Action, a History of the National Council of Social Service 1919-1969*, London, National Council of Social Service, 1969
- Bridie, J., *One Way of Living*, London, Constable, 1939.
- Bridie, J., and McLaren, M., *A Small Stir: Letters on the English*, London, Hollis and Carter, 1949
- Briggs, A. (Ed.), *William Morris, Selected Writings and Designs*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1980
- Broadie, A., *The Scottish Enlightenment*, Edinburgh, Birlinn, 2001

- Broadie, A., (Ed.) *The Scottish Enlightenment, An Anthology*, Edinburgh, Canongate, 1997
- Bron, A., Field, J., Kurantowicz, E., *Adult Education and Democratic Citizenship II*. Krakow, Impuls, 1998
- Brown, A; McCrone, D; Paterson, L; *Politics and Society in Scotland*, London, Macmillan, 1998
- Bruce, M., *The Coming of the Welfare State*, London, Batsford, 1974
- Burrow, J.W., *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1966
- Burger, P., *The Negation of the Autonomy of Art by the Avant-Garde*, in Docherty, T., *Postmodernism, A Reader*, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993
- Butler, J.D., *Idealism in Education*, New York, Harper and Row, 1966
- Caird, E., *A Critical Account of the Philosophy of Kant*, Glasgow, Maclehose, 1877
- Calder, A., *The Peoples War*, London, Pimlico, 1969
- Campbell, G.A., *The Civil Service in Britain*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1955
- Campbell, I., *Carlyle's Religion*, in Clubbe (Ed), *Carlyle and His Contemporaries*, Durham (North Carolina), Duke University, 1976.
- Carlyle, T., *Past and Present*, London, Chapman and Hall, 1899
- Carlyle, T., *Signs of the Times* (1829), from *Collected Writings*, Vol. XXVII, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, London, Chapman and Hall, 1899
- Carlyle, T., *Sartor Resartus*, Oxford University Press, 1987
- Cate, G.A., *Ruskin's Discipleship to Carlyle: a Revaluation*, in Clubbe (Ed), *Carlyle and His Contemporaries*, Durham (North Carolina), Duke University, 1976
- Caw, J., *Scottish Painting, 1680-1908*, Bath, Kingsmead, 1975
- Cazalet Keir, T., *From the Wings*, London, The Bodley Head, 1967
- Checkland, O., *Philanthropy in Victorian Scotland: Social Welfare and the Voluntary Principle*, Edinburgh, John Donald, 1980
- Chitnis, A. C., *The Scottish Enlightenment & Early Victorian English Society*, London, Croom Helm, 1986
- Clark, J., Heinemann, M., Margolies, D., Snee, C., *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the Thirties*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1979

- Clark, K., *The Other Half - a Self- Portrait*, London, John Murray, 1977
- Clarke, J., Cochrane, A., Smart, C., *Ideologies of Welfare*, London, Hutchinson, 1987
- Copleston, F., *A History of Philosophy*, London, Search Press, 1975
- Craig, C., *Out of History: Narrative Paradigms in Scottish and British Culture*, Edinburgh, Polygon, 1996
- Craig, F.W.S., *British Election Manifestos 1900-1974*, London, Macmillan, 1975
- Cross, C., *Philip Snowden*, London, Barrie and Rockliffe, 1966
- Crow, T., *Modern Art in the Common Culture*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1996
- Cummings, M., and Katz, R., (Eds) *The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan*, Oxford University Press, 1987
- Cunningham, G.W. *The Idealistic Argument in Recent British and American Philosophy*, New York and London, The Century Co., 1933
- Cultural Policy Collective, *Beyond Social Inclusion; Towards Cultural Democracy*, 2004
- Cursiter, S., *Scottish Art*, London, Harrap, 1949
- Daiches, D., *A Companion to Scottish Culture*, London, Edward Arnold, 1981
- Davie, G., *The Democratic Intellect*, Edinburgh University Press, 1961
- Davie, G., *The Crisis of the Democratic Intellect*, Edinburgh, Polygon, 1986
- Davis, J.W., *Keynes's Philosophical Development*, Cambridge University Press, 1994
- Davis Smith, *The Voluntary Tradition, Philanthropy and Self-Help in Britain 1500-1945*, in Davis Smith, Rochester and Hedley (Eds.), *An Introduction to the Voluntary Sector*, London, Routledge, 1995
- Devine, T., *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000*, London, Allen Lane, the Penguin Press, 1999
- Dickson, A., and Treble, J. H., *People and Society in Scotland, Vol. III, 1914-1990*, Edinburgh, John Donald, 1992
- Donnachie, I., (Ed.) *Forward! Labour Politics in Scotland*, Edinburgh University Press, 1989
- Eliot, T.S., *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, London, Faber and Faber, 1948

- Ellis, E.L., *T.J.: A Life of Dr. Thomas Jones CH*, Cardiff, University of Wales, 1993
- Ergang, R. R., *Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism*, New York, Octagon, 1976
- Evans, B. I. and Glasgow, M., *The Arts in England*, London, Falcon Press, 1949
- Faber, G., *Jowett, a portrait with background*, London, Faber and Faber, 1957
- Faulkner, M., (Ed.). *Grey Lodge, 1888-1988; A Century of Concern*, Dundee, Grey Lodge, 1988
- Feagin, S., and Maynard, P., *Aesthetics*, Oxford University Press, 1997
- Ferguson, A., *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*, Cambridge University Press, 1995
- Fergusson, J.D., *Modern Scottish Art*, Glasgow, McLellan, 1943
- Fieldhouse, R., (Ed) *A History of Modern British Adult Education*, Leicester, National Institute for Adult and Continuing Education, 1996
- Fitch, J., *Thomas and Matthew Arnold and their Influence on English Education*, London, Heinemann, 1907
- Finlay, I., *Art in Scotland*, Oxford University Press, 1948
- Finlay, I., *Scotland*, London, Chatto and Windus, 1957
- Findlay, R., *Independent and Free*, Edinburgh, John Donald, 1994
- Finlayson, G., *Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain, 1830-1990*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994
- Fitzgibbons, A., *The Significance of Keynes's Idealism*, in Bateman, B.W., and Davis, J.W., *Keynes and Philosophy; Essays on the Origin of Keynes's Thought*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1991
- Fitzgibbons, A., *Keynes's Vision*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1988
- Flett, I., *The Years of Growth 1945-1975*, Edinburgh, Association of Directors of Education for Scotland, 1989
- Forgacs, D., *The Antonio Gramsci Reader*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1999
- Fry, M., *Patronage and Principle*, Aberdeen University Press, 1987
- Galbraith, R., *Without Quarter: a Biography of Tom Johnston, 'The Uncrowned King of Scotland'*, Edinburgh, Mainstream, 1995

- Gellner, E., *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1990
- Gibson, J.S., *The Thistle and the Crown, A History of the Scottish Office*, Edinburgh, HMSO, 1985.
- Gilbert, B.B., *British Social Policy, 1914-1939*, London, Batsford, 1970
- Gilbert, K.E., and Kuhn, H., *A History of Aesthetics*, New York, Dover, 1972
- Glasgow, M., *The Concept of the Arts Council*, in Keynes M. (Ed.), *Essays on John Maynard Keynes*, Cambridge University Press, 1975
- Goodman, A., *Tell Them I'm On My Way*, London, Chapmans, 1993
- Gosden, P.J. H., *Education in the Second World War*, London, Methuen, 1976.
- Gordon, E., *The Royal Scottish Academy*, Edinburgh, Charles Skilton, 1976
- Green, S.J.D., and Whiting, R.C., *The Boundaries of the State in Modern Britain*, Cambridge University Press, 1996
- Guttsman, W.L. *The British Political Elite*, London, McGibbon and Kee, 1963
- Hague, D.C., Mackenzie, W.J.M., and Barker, A., *Public Policy and Private Interests, the Institutions of Compromise*, London, Macmillan, 1975
- Haldane, R. B., *An Autobiography*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1929
- Hardy, F., *Film in Scotland*, Edinburgh University Press, 1990
- Harris, J., *Private Lives, Public Spirit; A Social History of Britain, 1870-1914*, Oxford University Press, 1993
- Harris, J., *Political Thought and the Welfare State, 1870-1940: An Intellectual Framework for British Social Policy* in Gladstone (Ed.), *Before Beveridge: Welfare Before the Welfare State*, London, IEA Health and Welfare Unit, 1999
- Harris, J., *Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain*, University of Chicago, 1970
- Harrison, J.F.C., *A History of the Working Men's College, 1854-1954*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954
- Harrop, S. (Ed.) *Oxford and Working-class Education*, University of Nottingham, 1987
- Hartley, A., *A State of England*, London, Hutchison, 1963
- Hartley, A.J., *The Novels of Charles Kingsley: A Christian Social Interpretation*, Folkestone, Hour-Glass Press, 1977

- Harvie, C., *Scotland and Nationalism - Scottish Society and Politics 1707-1994*, London, Routledge, 1994
- Harvie, C., *No Gods and Precious Few Heroes: Twentieth Century Scotland*, Edinburgh University Press, 1998
- Hayes, C., *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism*, New York, Russell and Russell, 1968
- Henry, I. P., *The Politics of Leisure Policy*, London, Macmillan, 1993
- Hetherington, H., *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Jones*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1924
- Hetherington, H., and Muirhead, J.H., *Social Purpose*, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1918
- Hetherington, S., *Katherine Atholl 1874-1960: Against the Tide*, Aberdeen University Press, 1991
- Hewison, R., *Culture and Consensus: England, art and politics since 1940*, London, Methuen, 1995
- Hilton, T., *John Ruskin: The Early Years*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1985
- Hollis, P., *Jennie Lee: a Life*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997
- Honeyman, T.J., *Art and Audacity*, London, Collins, 1971
- Horne, D., *The Public Culture: the Triumph of Industrialism*, London, Pluto Press, 1986
- Howie, L., and Austick, M., *Engineers, Managers and Politicians*, London, Macmillan, 1982
- Hudson, J.W., *The History of Adult Education*, London, Woburn, 1969
- Hutchinson, J., & Smith, A., (Eds.) *Nationalism*, Oxford University Press, 1994
- Hutchison, D., *The Modern Scottish Theatre*, Glasgow, Molendinar Press, 1977
- Hutchison, E.M., *From British Institute to National Institute, 1921-1971*, in *Aim and Action in Adult Education*, London, National Institute of Adult Education, 1971
- Hutchison, R., *The Politics of the Arts Council*, London, Sinclair Browne, 1982
- Illingworth, C., *University Statesman: Sir Hector Hetherington*, Glasgow, George Outram, 1971

Inglis, J., et al: *Pulling Together in Adult Education: A History of the Scottish Institute for Adult and Continuing Education, 1949-1989*, Glasgow, Scottish Institute for Adult and Continuing Education, 1989

Isaac, W., *Alfred Wareing: A Biography*, London, Green Bank Press, [n.d.]

Jessop, R., *Carlyle and Scottish Thought*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1997

Jones, H., *Idealism as a Practical Creed*, Glasgow, Maclehose, 1910

Jones, H., and Muirhead, J.H., *The Life and Philosophy of Edward Caird*, Glasgow, Maclehose, Jackson and Co., 1921

Jones, S.G., *The British Labour Movement and Film, 1918-1939*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987

Jones, T., *Leeks and Daffodils*, Newtown, Welsh Outlook Press, 1942

Jones, T., *Welsh Broth*, London, W. Griffiths and Co., 1950

Jones, T., *A Diary with Letters 1931-50*, Oxford University Press, 1954

Johnston, T., *Memories*, London, Collins, 1952

Jordanova, L., *History in Practice*, London, Arnold, 2000

Keynes, J.M., *Collected Writings*, Moggridge, D., (Ed.), London, Macmillan (for the Royal Economic Society) 1989. Vol. X, *Biographical Writings (My Early Beliefs, September 1939)*; Vol. XXVIII: *Social, Political and Literary Writings, (Art and the State, The Listener, August 1936 and The Arts Council - Its Policies and its Hopes (radio transcript) The Listener, Vol. XXXIV, 12 July 1945)*

Keynes, M.(Ed.), *Essays on John Maynard Keynes*, Cambridge University Press, 1975

Knox, H.M., *Two Hundred and Fifty Years of Scottish Education, 1696-1946*, Edinburgh and London, Oliver and Boyle, 1953

Kelly, T., *A History of Adult Education in Great Britain*, Liverpool University Press, 1992

Kelly, T., *Outside the Walls; Sixty Years of University Extension at Manchester, 1886-1946*, Manchester University Press, 1950

Le Quesne, A. L., *Victorian Thinkers*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993

Layburn, K., *The Evolution of British Social Policy and the Welfare State*, Keele University Press, 1995

Lenman, B., *An Economic History of Modern Scotland*, London, Batsford, 1977

Lewis, C. Day, *The Mind in Chains: Socialism and the Cultural Revolution*, London. Muller, 1937

Lewis, R., *Leaders and Teachers: Adult Education and the Challenge of Labour in South Wales, 1906-1940*, Studies in Welsh History 9, Cardiff, University of Wales, 1993

Low, R., *The History of British Film*, Vol. V, London, Routledge, 1997

Lundgren, J.R., *The Social Philosophy of Adam Smith*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1973

McCrone, D., *Understanding Scotland: the Sociology of a Stateless Nation*, London, Routledge, 1992

McCrone, D., Kendrick, S., Straw, P. (Eds.) *The Making of Scotland: Nation, Culture and Social Change*, Edinburgh University Press, 1989.

McCulloch, M., *Modernism and Nationalism: Literature and Society in Scotland 1918-1939; Source documents for the Scottish Renaissance*, Glasgow University Press, 2004

Mackenzie, A.M., *The Kingdom of Scotland, A Short History*, Glasgow, Chambers, 1957

MacKenzie, J.S., *Introduction to Social Philosophy*, Glasgow, Maclehose, 1890

Macmillan, D., *Scottish Art 1460-1990*, Edinburgh, Mainstream, 1991

Macmillan, D., *Scottish Art in the 20th Century*, Edinburgh, Mainstream, 1993

Macmillan, H.P., *A Man of Law's Tale*, London, Macmillan, 1952

McPherson, A., and Raab, C., *Governing Education, A Sociology of Policy Since 1945*, Edinburgh University Press, 1988

Manning, D.J., *Liberalism*, London, Dent, 1976

Mansbridge, A., *An Adventure in Working Class Education*, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1920

Markham, F., *A Report on the Museums and Art Galleries of the British Isles (other than the National Museums) to the Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees*, Edinburgh, Constable, 1938

Marwick, A., *The Home Front: the British and the Second World War*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1976

Mavor, R., *Dr. Mavor and Mr. Bridie-Memoirs of James Bridie*, Edinburgh, Canongate and National Library of Scotland, 1988

- Meller, H., *Patrick Geddes, Social Evolutionist and City Planner*, London, Routledge, 1990
- Midwinter, A., Keating, M., and Mitchell, J., *Politics and Public Policy in Scotland*, London, Macmillan, 1991
- Miers, H., *A Report on The Public Museums of the British Isles (other than the National Museums to the Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees)*, Edinburgh, Constable, 1928.
- Miller, K., (Ed.) *Memoirs of a Modern Scotland*, London, Faber and Faber, 1970
- Minihan, J., *The Nationalisation of Culture*, London, Hamish Hamilton, 1977
- Miskell, L., Whatley, C., and Harris, B., (Eds.), *Victorian Dundee: Image and Realities*, East Linton, Tuckwell Press, 2002
- Mitchell, L., *Strategies for Self-Government – The Campaigns for a Scottish Parliament*, Edinburgh, Polygon, 1996
- Morgan, E., *Crossing the Border; essays on Scottish Literature*, Manchester, Carcanet, 1990
- Morgan, K.O., *Labour People; Hardie to Kinnock*, Oxford University Press, 1992
- Morgan, K.O., *The People's Peace*, Oxford University Press, 1990
- Morrison, J., *Painting the Nation: Identity and Nationalism in Scottish Painting, 1800-1920*, Edinburgh University Press, 2003
- Morton, G., *Unionist Nationalism; Governing Urban Scotland, 1830-1860*, East Linton, Tuckwell, 1999
- Mowat, C.L., *The Charity Organisation Society*, London, Methuen, 1961
- Mowat, C.L., *The Condition of Britain in the Thirties*, in Lochhead, A.V.S., *A Reader in Social Administration*, London, Constable, 1968
- Muir, E., *Scottish Journey*, London, Heinemann, 1935
- Murphy, R., (Ed.) *The British Cinema Book*, London, British Film Institute, 1997
- Normand, T., *The Modern Scot; Modernism and Nationalism in Scottish Art, 1928-1955*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000
- Oakley, C., *21 Years of the Scottish Film Council*, Glasgow, Scottish Film Council, 1955
- O'Donnell, R.M., *Keynes: Philosphy, Economics & Politics*, London, Macmillan, 1989

- Osborne, C., *Giving it Away: The Memoirs of an Uncivil Servant*, London, Secker and Warburg, 1986
- Paterson, L., *The Autonomy of Modern Scotland*, Edinburgh University Press, 1994
- Peacock, A.T., *Welfare Economics and Public Subsidies to the Arts*, Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies, December 1969
- Pearson, N., *The State and the Visual Arts*, London, Open University, 1982
- Peddie, J.R., *The First 50 Years, The Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland, 1901-1951*, Edinburgh, Pillans and Wilson, 1951
- Peers, R., *Adult Education, A Comparative Study*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972
- Pelling, H., *Britain and the Second World War*, Glasgow, Collins (Fontana), 1970
- Perkin, H., *The Rise of Professional Society; England since 1880*, London and New York, Routledge, 1989
- Peter, B., *100 Years of Glasgow's Amazing Cinemas*, Edinburgh, Polygon, 2000
- Peters, A.J., *British Further Education*, London, Pergamon, 1967
- Pick, J., *Vile Jelly-The Birth, Life and Lingering Death of the Arts Council of Great Britain*, Doncaster, Brynmill Press, 1991
- Poggi, G., *The Development of the Modern State*, London, Hutchinson, 1978
- Pollitt, C., Lewis, L., Negro, J., Patten, J., *Public Policy in Theory and Practice*, London, Hodder and Stoughton and the Open University, 1979
- Pottinger, G., *The Secretaries of State for Scotland*, Edinburgh University Press, 1978
- Quinn, R-B.M., *Public Policy and the Arts*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1998
- Read, H., *To Hell With Culture*, London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1941
- Richter, M., *The Politics of Conscience: T.H. Green and his Age*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964
- Robertson, W., *Welfare in Trust 1930 - 1963*, London, Constable, 1964
- Robson, R., *Ideas and Institutions in Victorian Britain*, London, Bell, 1967
- Rose, J., *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2001
- Ruskin, J., *Unto This Last*, Orpington, George Allen, 1882

- Ruskin, J., *Sesame and Lilies*, London, George Allen, 1905
- Sampson, S., *Anatomy of Britain*, London, Hodder and Staughton, 1962
- Scotland, J., *The History of Scottish Education, Vol. II*, University of London, 1969
- Scott, D., *A.D. Lindsay, A Biography*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1971
- Seth, J., *English Philosophers and Schools of Philosophy*, London, Dent, 1912
- Shaw, R., *The Arts and the People*, London, Cape, 1987
- Sherington, J., *To Speak its Name with Pride; the Work of the Films of Scotland Committee, 1938-1982*, Glasgow, Scottish Film Council, 1996
- Simon, B., *The Politics of Educational Reform 1920-1940*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1974
- Simon, B., *Education and the Social Order 1940-1990*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1991
- Simon, B., (Ed.), *The Search for Enlightenment: the Working Class and Adult Education in the Twentieth Century*, Leicester, National Institute of Adult and Continuing Education, 1990
- Sinclair, A., *Arts and Cultures, the History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain*, London, Sinclair-Stevenson, 1995
- Skidelsky, R., *John Maynard Keynes, Fighting for Britain 1937-1946*, London, Macmillan, 2000
- Smart, W., *Second Thoughts of an Economist*, London, Macmillan, 1916
- Smith, M., Parker, S., Smith, C., (Eds.) *Leisure and Society in Britain*, London, Allen Lane, 1973
- Soffer, R.N., *Ethics and Society in England: The Revolution in the Social Sciences, 1870-1914*, London, University of California Press, 1978
- Strauss, A., Corbin, J., *Basics of Qualitative Research*, London, Sage, 1998
- Taylor, B., *Art for the Nation*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1999
- Titmuss, R., *Problems of Social Policy*, London, HMSO, 1950
- Thompson, E.P., *William Morris*, London, Merlin Press, 1977
- Tonge, J., *The Arts of Scotland*, London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1938

Vincent, A., and Plant, R., *Philosophy, Politics and Citizenship: The Life and Thought of the British Idealists*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1984

Watkins, P., *A Welshman Remembers*, Cardiff, William Lewis, 1944

Webb, K., *The Growth of Nationalism*, Glasgow, Molendinar Press, 1977

Wheeler-Bennett, J.W., *John Anderson, Viscount Waverley*, London, Macmillan, 1962

White, A.K., & MacBeath, A., *The Moral Self*, London, Edward Arnold, 1923

White, E.W., *The Arts Council of Great Britain*, London, Davis Poynter, 1975

Winch, D., *Adam Smith's Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 1978

Williams, R., *The Arts Council*, in *Resources of Hope - Culture, Democracy, Socialism*, London, Verso, 1989

Williams, W.E., *The Pre-History of the Arts Council*, in Hutchinson (Ed), *Aim & Action in Adult Education, a memoir to mark fifty years of service by the British and National Institutes of Adult Education, 1921-1971*, London, University of Nottingham, 1971

Wiltshire (Ed.) *The 1919 Report: The Final and Interim Reports of the Adult Education Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction 1918-1919*, reprinted with introductory essays by Wiltshire et al, University of Nottingham, 1980

Witts, R., *Artist Unknown: an Alternative History of the Arts Council*, London, Little, Brown, 1998

Woodroffe, K., *From Charity to Social Work in England and the United States*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962

Journals

Levitt, I., *The Scottish Secretary, the Treasury and the Scottish Grant Equivalent, 1888-1970*, in *Scottish Affairs*, No. 28, Edinburgh University, 1999.

Leventhal, "The Best for the Most": CEMA and State Sponsorship of the Arts in Wartime, 1939-1945, in *Twentieth Century British History*, Vol. 1 No. 3, 1990

Unpublished Sources

Griffin, J., *A Study of the Development of Adult Education in Scotland*, PhD Thesis, St. Andrews University, 1953

Smith, A., *Visual Art and the Construction of Cultural Identity in Scotland, 1918-1945*, PhD thesis, Aberdeen University Special Collections, 1998 SMI

Reports

Adult Education: the Challenge of Change, The Alexander Report, Edinburgh, HMSO, 1975

Further Education, A Report by the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland, Scottish Education Department, Cmnd 8454 Edinburgh, HMSO, 1952

Report of the Royal Commission on Scottish Affairs 1952-1954 (The Balfour Report), Cmnd. 9212, Edinburgh, HMSO, 1954

Training for Citizenship, Report of the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland, Scottish Education Department, Cmnd. 6495, Edinburgh, HMSO, 1943

The Visual Arts: Report of The Arts Enquiry, sponsored by Dartington Hall trustees, Oxford, Political and Economic Planning with Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1946

Annual Reports

Arts Council of Great Britain: Annual Reports, 1945-46 and 1946-47

British Institute of Adult Education: Annual Reports, 1936-37 to 1946-47

Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts: Annual Reports, 1942-43 to 1944-45

Pilgrim Trust: Annual Reports, 1930-31 to 1945-46

Website

Office for National Statistics: O'Donoghue, J., Goulding, L., and Allen, G., Consumer Price Inflation since 1750 (2003)

Archives (Acronyms)

AAG	Aberdeen Art Gallery
ACE	Arts Council of England
GU	Glasgow University (Special Collections)
KCC	Kings College, Cambridge
NA	National Archives (formerly Public Record Office)
NAS	National Archives of Scotland
NIACE	National Institute for Adult and Continuing Education
NLS	National Library of Scotland
NLW	National Library of Wales
RSA	Royal Scottish Academy
SFTA	Scottish Film and Television Archive (Scottish Screen)
VA	Victoria and Albert Museum (Art and Design Archive)